DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 719

EC 032 039

TITLE	The Development and Evaluation of Reality-Based Simulation Materials for the Training of Special Education Administrators in State Departments of Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Div. of Special Education and Rehabilitation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
GRANT	OEG-0-70-1290(603)
NOTE	233p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role, *Exceptional Child Research, Inservice Education, Models, *Professional Education, *Simulation, State Departments of Education, Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A project was conducted to develop and evaluate a reality-based simulation model of the role of a Special Education administrator in a state education agency, for use in the training of administrators of Special Education in state education agencies. Three specific objectives of the study were to develop a set of reality-based items based on observed situations in state education agencies, develop a training model using these items in a simulated environment approach, and assess the model's effect on trainees in the skill areas of information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning. Implementation of the training model consisted of administering the materials to 23 new staff members of different state education agencies during a 2-week workshop. Evaluation instruments included interviews with subjects, completion of a written opinionnaire by subjects following the workshop, and administration of the Trial Problem Solving Exercise to measure growth of skill in information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning. Evaluation data showed the study successful in achieving the first two specific objectives (development of materials and use as training model), but no evidence confirmed the effectiveness of the simulation exercise on the three target skill areas. (KW)

Project # 24-1002
OE/BEH
EC

ED0 48719

FINAL REPORT
Special Training Project
OEG-0-70-1290 (603)

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF REALITY-BASED SIMULATION MATERIALS FOR THE TRAINING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

December 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF REALITY-BASED SIMULATION MATERIALS FOR THE TRAINING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS IN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

FINAL REPORT

Special Project Grant
OEG-0-70-1290(603)

DANIEL D. SAGE
Project Director

EDWARD W. SONTAG
Research Associate

Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Syracuse University

December 1970

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

CONTENTS

Chapters Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1
  Statement of the Problem. 1
  Background and Significance 3
  Purpose 11
  Design. 13
  Assumptions and Limitations 13

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16
  Simulation as a General Approach. 16
  Simulation in General Education 26
  Simulation in General Education Administration. 29
  Simulation in Special Education Administration. 34
  Simulation and Transfer of Training 38
  Summary 41

III. MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT 43
  Development of Background Materials 45
  Development of Task Materials 50
  Development of Supplemental Simulation Material 64
  Summary 68

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE SIMULATION MATERIALS 69
  Subjects. 70
  Description of the Workshop 75
  Evaluation. 79

V. RESULTS OF THE STUDY 83
  Results of the Workshop Interview Schedule. . . 83
  Results of the Opinionnaire 86
  Results of the Trial Problem Solving Exercise . 88

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 94
  Summary of Objectives, Methods and Findings . . 94
  Conclusions 96
  Recommendations 99
  Concluding Statement. 101

Page

Appendices

A. BACKGROUND MATERIALS 112

B. STATE DEPARTMENT OBSERVATION FORMS 142

C. STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTING SYSTEM. 160

D. SAMPLES OF WRITTEN REALITY-BASED IN-BASKET ITEMS 164

E. SAMPLE PHONE CALL ITEM 181

F. SAMPLES OF ROLE-PLAY ASSIGNMENTS 188

G. SAMPLES OF SPECIAL ACTIVITY ASSIGNMENTS. 192

H. SAMPLE RESPONSE FORMS. 197

I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 201

J. INSTITUTE APPLICATION FORM 203

K. INSTITUTE SCHEDULE 205

L. WORKSHOP EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 208

M. WORKSHOP EVALUATION OPINIONNAIRE 210

N. TRIAL PROBLEM SOLVING EXERCISE 215

O. SCORING CATEGORIES FOR THE TRIAL PROBLEM SOLVING EXERCISE 223

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Level of Participation of State Education Agencies. 46

2. Distribution of Task Activity Items into Activity Dimension of Process Analysis Model. . . 57

3. Distribution of Task Activity Items into Co-Respondent Dimension of Process Analysis Model 57

4. Distribution of Task Activity Items into Content Dimension of Process Analysis Model . . . 58

5. Comparison of Collected Activity Items with In-Basket Items Included in the Simulation Exercise on the Co-Respondent Dimension of the Process Analysis Model. 62

6. Comparison of Collected Activity Items with In-Basket Items Included in the Simulation Exercise on the Content Dimension of the Process Analysis Model. 63

7. Months of Administrative Experience in State Education Agencies. 71

8. Master's Degree Major of Subjects. 73

9. Graduate and Undergraduate Hours in Special Education Administration. 73

10. Professional Experience of Subjects in Special Education Teaching. 74

11. Professional Experience of Subjects in Special Education Supervision or Administration 74

12. Circumstances of Subjects' Attendance at the Workshop. 76

13. Percentage of Agreement Between Raters on the Three Dimensions of the T.P.S.E. Forms A and B. . 91

14. Comparison of Subjects' Responses on the Three Dimensions of the Trial Problem Solving Exercise. 93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The educational community, during the past ten years, has observed extraordinary and spontaneous generation of thousands of additional Special Education classes and related services throughout the United States. The first few years of this growth saw a correlative increase in the training of teaching staff to adequately fill the needs of these programs on the classroom level (Mackie, 1965). It became increasingly apparent, however, that there was a growing lack of competent personnel to administer and supervise on the local, state and federal levels. In response, in 1965, P.L. 89-105 provided for the inclusion of the training of administrators in the federally supported training programs and for program development in this area (Martin, 1968). During the 1969-1970 school year, there were 18 such training programs supported by federal funding (Henley, 1969).

Despite recent innovations in the development of training instruments, such as Sage's (1967) Special Education Administration Task Simulation game and the University of

Pittsburgh's (1969) modification of the "Madison" reality-based simulator, there would appear to be a shortage of basic instructional materials useable for the adequate preparation of administrators and coordinators of programs of Special Education.

Although the P.L. 85-926 directives, as amended by Title III of P.L. 88-164, implicitly state that state directors and supervisors of Special Education be chosen on the basis of special training and experience, and proven merit and leadership quality, criteria for the selection of trainee personnel have yet to be clearly defined (President's Panel on Mental Retardation, 1963). There is still no generally acceptable, specific curriculum for such training programs and, most important, there is still a crucial need for national standards describing the specialized and unique skills and merits necessary for the administration of Special Education programs.

Wyatt (1967), in studying the needs of leadership personnel in the field of Special Education, found that about 120 new Special Education administrative personnel would be needed in state Special Education units each year from 1968 through 1970. There is currently no training model to explore the role and function of Special Education administrative personnel in state education agencies. This study, then, is an attempt to respond to that need.

Background and Significance

Within this century, the United States has developed a thriving economy which is unparalleled in history. Now, much of the rest of the world is emulating this development. The revolutionary changes in technology which have fostered these achievements are apparent to all. However, not so obvious are the radical changes in management which have paralleled the technological innovations. The emergence of the professional manager is one significant indicator of the changes that have occured in management thought and practices. The problems of management have confronted military, government and business leaders since antiquity. Only in the twentieth century, however, has there evolved a systematic examination of management thought, the objective of which is to codify emperically developed principles into a theory of management. Because the world is changing, the theory is imprecise and still incomplete. It must be constantly changed and revised (Cleland & King, 1968).

In 1966, Connor stated, "The emerging trend is the substitution of scholarship for know-how" (p. 161).

According to him, the present state of knowledge in administration of Special Education indicates the need for more information regarding incident, definitions, finances, organizational techniques, decision making, power structure, leadership qualities, curricular effectiveness, political activity, personal values, selection of personnel, preparation patterns, and community influences. The tendency of some university programs, he said, to value research procedures and statistical studies while neglecting the increasing knowledge and sophisticated techniques of influencing human behavior, is an unfortunate trend.

Hodgson (1964) believes that professors of School Administration in colleges and universities preparing administrators and supervisors for regular schools, as well as for Special Education, may be critically ignorant of, or in disagreement with, modern concepts of programs and processes involving public education of exceptional children.

The statement of goals adapted by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education at its annual meeting in 1964 and reported on by Milazzo & Blessing included the statement that "Greater attention be directed to the development of prospective Special Education leadership personnel in internship activities, particularly at the state department level. Clarification of desirable internship programs and practicum experiences is indicated as an area to assure the provision of necessary breadth and experimental background" (p. 140). Inherent in this statement is the assumption that it is important for potential leadership personnel in the field of Special Education to become knowledgeable of the operation and function of state departments of education. Theoretically, this rationale would hold true even if the participants do not intend to seek employment in state departments of education.

School administration, in general, has lacked a unifying theory around which to solidify. It has lacked a way of looking at itself. Likewise, both practitioners and students have lacked a procedure or method by which they could examine school administration (Griffiths, 1956).

Willenberg (1966) in reviewing the literature to that date indicates three basic problems:

1. There is lacking a clear theoretical basis for the administration of Special Education at the federal, state, and local levels.
2. The need and responsibility for such research has not been clearly established on a priority basis within the various research establishments.

3. There are not enough well-trained persons to do the kind of research job that is needed.

He claims that in the future the researcher should seek solutions to specific operational problems. His studies must reach beyond the boundaries of self-assessment and self-analysis. Broad cross-sectional and national investigations are needed in addition to longitudinal studies.

Although the selection and training of good administrators in any field is widely recognized as a most pressing problem, there is surprisingly little agreement among executives on what makes a good administrator. The executive development programs in some of the nation's leading corporations and universities reflect a tremendous variation in objectives.

In 1955, Katz developed an approach, which is not based on what good executives are (their innate traits and characteristics), but rather on what they can do (the kinds of skills which they exhibit in carrying out their jobs effectively). As used here, a skill implies an ability which can be developed, not necessarily inborn, and which is manifested in performance, not merely in potential. The principal criterion of skillfulness, according to Katz, must be effective action under varying conditions. This approach suggests that effective administration rests on three basic, developable skills which obviate the need for identifying specific traits, and which may provide a useful way of looking at and understanding the administrative process. It is assumed by Katz that an administrator is one who directs the activities of other persons and undertakes the responsibility for achieving certain objectives through these efforts. The skills as identified by Katz are:

1. Technical skill--an understanding of and a proficiency in a specific activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques.
2. Human skill--the ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team he leads.
3. Conceptual skill--the ability to see the enterprise as a whole, recognizing how the various functions of the organization depend on one another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others. This skill extends to visualizing the relationship of the individual part to the whole the community, and the political, social, and economic forces of the nation as a whole.

Katz's skill conception of administration suggests that one may hope to improve administrative effectiveness and to develop better administrators for the future. This conception implies learning by doing. Different people learn different ways, but skills are developed through practice and through relating learning to one's own personal experience and background.

Blessing (1966) reports on the techniques used in developing leadership personnel in state departments of education. These include internship, practicum experiences, "home office" experiences, psychological report development and transmission, "simulated day in the bureau," transcript evaluation and recommendation preparation.

Sargeant and Belisle (1955) report that behavioral learning for administrative roles involves consideration of kinds of mental experiences which are not necessarily involved in the transmission of knowledge. They believe that the development of a psychological scheme for training in administration must revolve around a central idea of learning a skill. The administrator's behavior is a complex force having impact upon the lives of persons both immediate and distant from his sphere of vision. They claim he has learned nothing from all his knowledge unless he knows what his awareness and behavior are in terms of these relationships; he can learn them only through the practice, the test, and the examination of his behavior in relation to situations.

Ramseyer (1955) identified and studied factors which influence leadership behavior in developing a broad program of education appropriate to meet the needs of the community. He isolated nine areas of administrative behavior in which most problems arise:

1. setting goals
2. making policy
3. determining roles
4. appraising effectiveness
5. coordinating administrative functions and structure
6. working with community leadership to promote improvements in education
7. using the educational resources of the community
8. involving people
9. communicating

A recent study conducted by Kothera (1967) is representative of a scientific look at the Special Education administrator on-the-job. Kothera says, "You cannot be trained to do the job; you must be prepared to meet and examine the problem, consider the alternatives and choose, based upon a broad background of research findings and identifiable consequences" (Kothera, 1967, p. 5).

Sage (1967), speaking about the administrative behavior of Special Education directors, comes to these conclusions: "It is clear that no single job description can approach an adequate coverage of the field encompassed by the term 'administration of Special Education' . . . . There is no category of administrative task or skill which the Special Education administrator can afford to ignore. The role, to a greater or lesser degree, involves all of the behavior involved in other educational administrative positions. The training and experience background for the role should therefore parallel to a considerable degree that of the general administrator . . . . The person in this role cannot afford to be ill-informed about the details with which his staff and his clientele are concerned in the provision for special needs. The training and experience background for the role should therefore insure proficiency in dealing directly with the business of instructing the exceptional child" (Sage, 1967, p. 7).

Studies by Howe (1960) and Connor (1963) reflect almost identical conclusions, agreeing in almost every respect with those cited above by Sage.

Purpose

A brief survey of presently existing educational administration training materials and models indicates that none are optimally appropriate for use in the training of administrators of Special Education in state departments of education because they are designed for use with regular school administrators or for Special Education administrators at the local level. In developing a model for training leadership personnel for the state level, it appears that it would be appropriate to use a format similar to that developed by Sage (1967), but incorporating improvements suggested by him and in other studies previously cited.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate a reality-based simulation model of the role of a Special Education administrator in a state education agency. A major research question posed was: Is there a measureable change in the behavior of participants attending a workshop utilizing the simulation model and specially designed materials? Behavior change in this setting was defined in terms of assessment instruments developed for this particular purpose. The materials, the workshop and the assessment instruments will be described thoroughly in Chapters III and IV.

In addition to the purpose stated above, it was concluded that the simulation vehicle developed should be designed to serve as a pre-internship experience related to state education agencies for individuals majoring in Special Education administration. It was also intended to be applicable as an in-service educational device for incumbent professional personnel in state education agencies, particularly for new personnel in such positions.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To develop a set of reality-based items based on observed situations in state education agencies.
2. To develop a training model utilizing such items within a simulated environment approach.
3. To assess the viability of the training model and to determine its effect on the trainees in the following skill areas:
   a. Information processing;
   b. Sensitivity to issues;
   c. Organizing and planning.

Design

Simulation material was developed to enable students and practitioners, both experienced and inexperienced, to assume the role of Director of Special Education in the simulated State of Lafayette.

This study was carried out in two stages: 1) development of materials; and 2) implementation and evaluation. The developmental stage consisted of further expanding the ground rules and background material for the State of Lafayette, which was the original simulated state developed by Sage for the SEATS game (1967), utilizing material collected from a variety of actual state education agencies, editing, selecting, and pilot testing of the reality-based problem items. The implementation and evaluation stage consisted of administering the materials to a group of new professional staff members in divisions of Special Education in various state education agencies during a two week workshop held at the Syracuse University campus in June, 1970. An examination of the participants' responses to materials presented and to the workshop as a whole would constitute the evaluation.

Assumptions and Limitations

The attempt to accomplish the objectives of this study by the chosen means implies a number of assumptions which are as follows:

1. That the material collected at random from cooperating state agencies does constitute reality, that is, a representative sampling of the present job functions of the administrator in the field.
2. That the simulation model developed from the data collected is an accurate representation of state education agencies.
3. That material based on present day reality will be of utility in enhancing the skills of persons who are assuming future oriented leadership roles.
4. That skill developed and demonstrated in a short term simulated situation can transfer to actual performance on the job.

To the extent that these assumptions fail to be realized, limitations on the viability of this study are imposed. A major limitation would appear to be the difficulty in identifying and measuring objectively those skills which are relevant to job performance and also accessible to influence in a simulation exercise.

The specific skills chosen for analysis--information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning--were adapted from a similar format developed by Jaffee (1967). In his work, he attempted to measure what he called "important management variables," as they related to a simulation exercise which he developed. The particular variables that he attempted to measure with a pre- and post-simulation test were sensitivity, organization and planning ability, and decision making. It is obvious that these variables are not totally exhaustive of the skill repertoire of a competent administrator, and that the focus on these skills imposes limitations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter on the review of the literature has five major purposes. The first purpose is to present a general overview of simulation as one approach in research and training, acknowledging both its advantages and limitations. The second purpose is to review the uses of simulation as a training tool in general education. A third objective is to highlight simulation as it has been used in preparing general education administrators. To discuss the uses of simulation in the training of administrators of Special Education is the fourth purpose of this chapter. And finally, the fifth purpose is to relate both the pros and cons in the controversy over the transferability of training through simulation. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Simulation as a General Approach

Every researcher concerned with the development, types, uses, advantages and limitations of simulation has, of course, a more or less different approach and point of view.

Barrett (1965) divides simulator models into three operational categories:

1. analytical--optimal solution arrived at mathematically.
2. iterative--optimal solution found by repetative trials.
3. training.

However, he stresses that, regardless of what kind of model it is, its builder (or worker) must have a goal, and that simulation does not give the answer or the solution to a problem. Simulation, he believes, is used to obtain satisfactory solutions, not necessarily to find the best solution.

Dawson (1962), on the other hand, divides simulators into categories according to their physical characteristics:

1. pure-machine simulators
    a. physical analog simulators
    b. mathematical models
2. man-machine simulators
3. gaming (competitive situations)
4. real-time simulators
5. Monte Carlo methods--probability distribution types

Dawson (1962) and Twelker (1968a) agree that the use of simulation can serve four major purposes:

1. design
2. research

3. training
4. teaching

Gagne (1954), on the other hand, maintains that the kinds of utilization of training devices are two: performance measurement and performance improvement. Although the two uses are frequently made of a single piece of equipment, they may be distinguished particularly in the characteristics of the device which are essential for each purpose. When the device is used for performance measurement the important characteristics are reliability and validity. When the device is employed for improving performance, the characteristic of importance is the amount of transfer of learning to an operational task.

In any case, the earliest practical use of simulation was in the construction of physical models of real objects for work in designing tools and other objects (Dawson, 1962). Twelker (1968b) has done considerable research into both the past history of simulation development and the present uses. Non-school, instructional uses of simulation in military, government, industry, and science include materials which:

1. focus on important political and operational factors in the transition from terrorism to guerilla warfare.

2. provide training in forest fire management.
3. provide gaming experience for exercising and evaluating Civil Defense systems.
4. demonstrate that the relationship between law enforcement officers and the community is not competitive but cooperative.
5. simulate the growth of metropolitan areas and incorporate some of the theories of economics, political science, and sociology.
6. simulate the environments in which a farm business and a supermarket must operate.
7. introduce union leaders of small shops to the collective bargaining process.
8. simulate the actual conditions with which drivers may be faced under normal driving conditions.
9. portray the competitive and operational environment confronting a small manufacturer.
10. provide for learning a foreign language via automated programmed instruction with a simulated tutor.
11. simulate a signal device used by the Navy in transmitting messages from ship to ship.
12. simulate in-battle medical emergencies.

13. simulate a community hit by a localized natural disaster.
14. present a problem in orthopedic surgery patient management.

As early as 1962, over 100 business simulations were in use. Plattner and Herron (1962) favorably report on a model (Matrix or Management Trial Exercise) designed for use as an orientation to a potential career. One of the best known and most complex of the simulation material currently in use in the Carnegie Tech Management Game which has achieved the kind of complexity and realism desired by the authors (Cohen, Cyert, Dill, Kuehn, Miller, Van Wormer & Winters, 1962). Its purposes are: to develop the skills of abstracting, organizing and using information for a complex and diffuse environment; forecasting and planning; combining the roles of generalist and specialist; and working effectively with other people within a large corporation.

Gray and Graham (1968) report that recent studies support the idea that business games are most useful in assisting in personnel training and development. They also contend that when an individual's contribution can be isolated and when a system for measuring game performance is available, meaningful factors which can be related to success in a business game begin to emerge.

Business and industrial applications of simulation are also reported by Ekman (1961), Greenlaw, Herron and Rawdon (1962), and Hoggatt and Balderston (1963). Since investigations into simulation as a training device in the behavioral sciences are comparatively recent, the value of simulation in these areas is more potential than proven.

Since the controlling or standardizing of actual situations is inherently impossible, the techniques of simulation have been developed not only for training but for conducting research in numerous fields (Culbertson, 1960). Within the past decade, simulation has been used extensively in the behavioral sciences (psychology, social science, and political science), as well as in education. For example, Rome and Rome (1961) present a theoretical model for studying the decision-making process. In addition, Borko (1962) presents a collection of papers which relate the possible uses of simulation in behavioral sciences, while Baker (1962) and Feigenbaum (1962) describe relevant course offerings in simulation technique. Feigenbaum and Feldman (1963) investigate human problem solving behavior and the cognitive processes.

According to Dawson (1962), simulation, as a social science research technique, refers to the construction and manipulation of an operating model, that model being a physical or symbolic representation of all or some aspects of a social or psychological process. Simulation, for the social scientist, is the building of an operating model of an individual or group process and experimenting on this replication by manipulating its variables and their relationships. Basically, the social scientist simulates to investigate and to learn about the behavior of individual and group processes. Meir (1961), in his discussion of the simulation of social organization, asserts that the games, exercises and tasks involved in the simulation of organizations are contrived behaviors that have been abstracted from real life. Such behavior is enacted out of context, but the sequences of action create a context of their own which are not incompatible with what is being modeled. The exercises become important when they precede personal or group experience because the decisions made later in real life could easily be influenced by those in the game. The outcomes, if perceived as interesting or desirable, may serve as predictions of subsequent choices.

Among the many researchers who have noted the advantages and limitations of simulation are Wynn (1964), Immegart (1963), Barrett (1965), Plattner and Herron (1962), Dawson

(1962), and Cohen and Rehnman (1961). Briefly stated, these advantages and limitations are as follows:

Advantages

1. Simulation stimulates interest and motivation in learning and encourages the subject to behave as he might in reality. Learning by doing is manifest.
2. The written performances result in the accumulation of normative data and permits clinical examination and comparison of on-the-job behavior in identical situations.
3. Simulation permits the learner to profit from mistakes that might be disastrous on the job.
4. The instructor in the simulated situation can provide the subject with concepts, research evidence, models, and other information which he can't always provide on the job.
5. Simulation provides the opportunity to see the whole picture and view each problem in broad context.
6. Simulation presents the subject with an interesting object lesson in simulation as a medium of instruction which the subject may find useful in his own situation.

In research, simulation is likely to be most useful in the study of a situation in which a number of elements are interacting in complex ways. Other research techniques allow the researcher to deal with a large number of variables, provided those variables involve only the simple relationships; or to deal with complex relationships, providing only a few variables are involved. Scott, Lucas and Lucas (1966) believe that simulation holds the promise of allowing a researcher to handle a large number of variables and complex relationships. This means that the analysis of complex systems is no longer ruled out.

As a training tool, Twelker (1967), says, "Simulation allows for what people call 'constructive failure.' The technique enables students to make mistakes without hurting anyone, and to learn from those mistakes" (Twelker, 1967, p. 200).

Limitations

1. Simulation depends heavily on the competence of the instructor using it.
2. It is often expensive to produce and subject to obsolescence.
3. Considerable uninterrupted time is needed for full comprehension of background materials, etc., which often are a vital part of the model.

4. Some experts question the transferability of training.

One basic objection to the fundamental idea behind simulation which is often raised according to Scott, Lucas and Lucas (1966), relates to the question of congruence. It is asserted that one cannot simulate a situation until one understands it, and if one understands it in the first place, there is no need for simulation. However, it is suggested that the same sort of objection could be made to any model building technique. If one fully understands the field situation, then there is not any need for a model; and if one doesn't understand it, one is incapable of building a model of the situation. The response by Scott, Lucas and Lucas (1966) is, of course, that one starts with a limited understanding of the field situation and builds a model that incorporates this limited understanding. By studying the model and examining its workings, one may achieve insights which, when checked against the field situation, can be built into a second generation model which, in turn, will lead to new insights.

Another objection is that distortion may be introduced by the very fact that the exercise involves simulation. The motivation of the players may be altered because they feel they are only "playing a game." This may make them more competitive or adventurous than they normally are, or it may change their behavior in other ways. According to Scott, Lucas and Lucas (1966), while this factor needs to be weighed, it does not vitiate the idea of role playing in teaching situations. Players may be fully aware that they are involved in a game and yet become deeply immersed in it.

Also, Immegart (1963) believes that many of the materials found in simulation do not lend themselves to providing opportunities to cope with issues or problems of policy. This, he states, is particularly true of many education simulators. Problems are formulated in relation to a body of law and policy. Trainees are asked to make executive and administrative decisions rather than policy decisions. Materials are, thus, management oriented. In essence, Cohen and Rhenman (1961) agree and suggest that greater scope for creative and imaginative behavior be introduced into new simulation models.

Simulation in General Education

Simulation, as already noted, is not new to education; at least it is not new to non-public education. As previously mentioned, simulation has been used extensively for years in the military, in business, and in government. It is not really a radically new innovation which outmodes all others, but it does present another approach to instruction which hopefully can create a life-like environment for real-life response on the part of the student (Twelker, 1968a).

Cogswell, Egbert, Marsh and Yett (1964) describe a project that is making use of techniques relatively new to educational research--systems analysis and computer simulation. The purpose of the research is to find new solutions to implementing instructional media through analysis and simulation of school organization. It uses a simulated school to test educational innovations.

Bond (1965) used simulation techniques to change the attitudes of education majors toward professional course objectives. Although he was able to determine no significant differences in attitudes in his first study, he attributes this not to the simulation technique but to high variance estimates for both treatment groups and the initially high positive attitude of the subjects in both treatment groups.

Kersh (1963) developed a classroom simulation model which aided in the preparation of student teachers. Twelker (1967), reporting on Kersh's work, states that students who had undergone simulation training were ready to assume full responsibility three weeks earlier than a comparable group which did not have the training. He also found that students who had training through simulation learn instructional principles that subsequently are used in practice teaching.

Horvat (1967) reports on feedback as used with the Negotiations Game which he developed to simulate some of the conditions encountered within professional negotiations or professional bargaining sessions in educational contexts. He developed three major types of feedback, but determined that feedback on interaction, behavior, satisfaction and subsequent outcomes appear to be the most essential forms of feedback to provide to students of the negotiations process. He also determined that, in this particular game, feedback during the sessions is impossible without destroying the game's semblence to reality.

Cruickshank and Broadbent (1968) have studied the effects which pre-student teaching simulated encounters with teaching problems would have on subsequent behavior during student teaching. No controlled feedback was provided. Feedback resulted from the interaction of fellow students or teachers.

Cruickshank (1969) has compiled a fairly definitive report on the status of simulation in teacher education, and the status of simulation in the preparation of school personnel has also been extensively researched by Cruickshank and Broadbent (1970). They note that the greatest use of simulation has been in the preparation of teachers.

Simulation in General Education Administration

A milestone in the development of simulation in the area of educational administration was the innovation developed by and reported on by Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredericksen (1962). The simulated school district, generally known as the "Whitman School" was evolved for the purposes of determining the dimensions of the role of elementary school principal, developing understanding of the nature of such a position, providing information valuable to the solution of problems of selecting a school administrator, and supplying materials and instruments for the study and teaching of school administration. These materials included printed publications, tapes, films and situational test items to provide both background and in-basket items. The "Whitman School" tools have since been expanded and modified to include appropriate situations for the secondary school principal, the district superintendent, and the community college president.

Erickson (1964) has severely criticized the "Whitman School" material as having more to do with measuring talent than training administrators. Erickson questions the validity of the study because:

1. all responses were required not only to be verbal but to be in writing;

2. the responses occurred under stressful conditions including severe time limitations;
3. the in-basket items did not reflect the continuous interaction of a normal environment. The principals had no opportunity to govern their behavior in terms of feedback from individuals in the situations, and actions taken on an earlier problem were not reflected in later problems;
4. the subjects knew that they would not be held responsible for their actions in the usual work-a-day sense;
5. the researchers, including well-known scholars in administration, may have exerted some unintended influences upon their subjects.

Erickson believes that Hemphill, Griffiths and Fredericksen overlook the large unexplored area of behavior represented in non-verbal and casual interactive aspects of the administrator's impact on others. The in-basket scorers (limited to observation of the written responses) apparently were unable to discern important facets of the principal's behavior and personality that were evident to teachers and others who had access to verbal and non-verbal decision-oriented and casual aspects of the principal's behavior in on-going, interactive situations. Accordingly, says Erickson, the ratings of the in-basket scorers, when compared with the ratings of other judges, manifested much lower correlations with several personality factors.

Weinberger (1965) reports on the acceptance of simulated materials by professionals engaged in the training of school administrators. Weinberger's study is concerned with the extent to which simulation has been used, the purpose of such usage, and suggested improvements for future use. A general conclusion drawn from his data indicates a shift in training program emphasis from "technical theory" toward primary emphasis on the participant and his administrative behavior. Positive attributes of simulation as a training device are seen as "high student involvement and motivation, provision for skill practice in real but controlled situations, opportunity to compare administrative behavior, and a chance to test theories on real problems" (Weinberger, 1965, p. 3). He reports that in 1965 ninety institutions reported 125 professors of educational administration as users of simulation. These professors reported that the major purposes for which simulation had been used were conceptual learning, practice in skills, involvement, illustration of administrative materials, and self-evaluation of administrative behavior. Specific concepts of decision-making and group dynamics were emphasized. When recommending most effective use, this order changed to involvement, conceptual learning, self-evaluation, and practice in skills, with specific emphasis upon decision-making, perception and group dynamics.

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1964) provides information on simulated materials as the major teaching methods used in workshops which were held at the University of Chicago and Stanford University during the summers of 1959 and 1960.

Dillman and Cook (1969) applied simulation to the training of managers of educational research and development projects in order to improve their decision-making skills. The results suggest that simulation is a valuable supplementary method for the training of managers of research and development projects.

Bolton (1967), in a federally funded project, simulated the teacher selection process which allowed the subject to compare his own prediction of consequent behaviors and value systems with any pre-determined prediction and value system.

Bessent (1967) has developed a feedback procedure for administrative in-basket items. The intent of the design is limited to information searching, information processing, and rational decision processes. No major problems, he reports, exist as long as the subject is searching for information. This is a straight-forward procedure limited only by the builder's ingenuity in creating life-like responses. In fact, a great deal of versimilitude has been gained by the audiovisual components of this particular system. However, when the subject enters the giving information mode, difficulties are encountered. The problems are primarily connected with the judging and scoring. Premature decisions are indicated if the subject does not have all the information judged to be necessary to make that decision. A second problem is encountered in giving feedback for failure to evaluate information correctly or for a decision which is inconsistent with the subject's previous evaluation of information. His answer is stored for later comparison with his decision to determine where the inconsistency occurred. The disadvantage of this is that it breaks into the simulation mode. The subject must stop being the incumbent principal for a moment and become a student. A third major disadvantage is that selection of in-basket items is limited by the necessity to be judged and scored. This means, of course, that the trainee does not get the important learnings to be derived from deciding in situations characterized by high uncertainty. Finally, the simulation does not make it possible for the subject to get feedback on attempts to influence or change the existing set of conditions.

Three doctoral dissertations investigate the effects of simulation in improving problem-solving skills, the opinions of professors using simulation materials, a university training program using block-time simulation, and the number of possible uses of simulation (Fern, 1961; Broadhead, 1963; Shepard, 1964).

Simulation in Special Education Administration

The large majority of Special Education Administration training programs throughout the country are currently using or planning to use some type of simulation experience (Henley, 1969).

Sage's (1967) Special Education Administration Task Simulation (SEATS) Game was the first simulation material developed specifically and directly for use as media for training programs and for behavioral research in the process of Special Education Administration. The simulated environment, oriented from the view of the Director of Special Education in a medium sized and typically organized administrative structure, included complete background material and problem-solving situations in the form of communication in-basket items, taped telephone calls, filmed classroom observations and role-played conferences. A major emphasis was placed on the interpersonal relationships believed to be of significant importance to the maximal performance by Special Education Administrators.

In April 1970, Sage reported that, at that time, the SEATS Game had been used by its author 6 times for intensive 3 day workshops, 3 times for intensive 10 day workshops, and 3 times as an element within conventional semester courses. The SEATS Game was utilized, during one of the intensive 3 day workshops, in a rather unorthodox manner. Normally an instrument designed to be used in the training of Special Education administrators, the simulation model was used, during a Special Study Institute held in Westchester County, New York in November 1969, to acquaint public school administrators with the role of Special Education administration. The results of the institute indicate that the SEATS Game is an effective instrument when used for that purpose (Burke & Sage, 1969).

Another unconventional use of the SEATS Game was as a device for the orientation of other professors in the use of simulation generally and SEATS specifically. A particularly realistic innovation developed during this "micro-workshop"--that of the initiation of phone calls in response to in-basket items by the role-player himself--indicates that the instrument can evolve, grow and improve during its actual use (Sage, 1970a).

Although the SEATS Game has been used in sensitizing other groups to the problems of administration of Special Education and to orient other groups in the use of simulation, it would not appear to be optimally suited for use in the training of administrators of Special Education on the state level. It does not represent those problems and issues frequently encountered on the state level.

Stevens and O'Neil (1969) have reported on the modification of the present "Madison" reality-based simulator which was an outgrowth of the original "Whitman School." The "Madison" material has been expanded to include the position of Director of Special Education. Other modifications include 1) phases which concentrate on the pre-determined aspects of administrative behavior, 2) the development of programmed instructional material to supplement actual game sessions, and 3) the introduction of advanced management techniques. These materials are presently being edited and prepared for publication and production.

Doctoral dissertation research by Kothera (1967) and Hudson (1968) has led to the development of some Special Education Administration simulation media, but, as of this writing, these have not been produced for public use.

Of the recommendations resulting from Weinberger's

(1965) survey, several have been included in recent Special Education administration training models. Among those incorporated by Sage (1967) into the SEATS Game were the provision of a greater realism through filmed problems of which the participant is a part, telephone recording and playback systems which would reduce the unrealistic amount of written responding which had been necessary in previous systems; the provision for more open ended background data. As of this writing, the recommendation for systematic provision of feedback to the participant on the consequences of his decisions has not been incorporated into the simulation task materials of the existing educational administration training devices. Ohm (1968) has developed a model that would provide feedback on "items reflecting administrative conflict situations." It would appear that any new materials developed for the training of Special Education administrators should include this important aspect of simulation.

A survey of presently existing educational administration training models and materials indicates that none, apparently, are optimally appropriate for use in the training of administrators of Special Education in state education agencies. If professional personnel in the state agencies are to provide the quality leadership in the field of Special

Education that is expected of them, it is imperative that a training model be available to provide specialized training and in-service education.

Simulation and Transfer of Training

The goals of any program for educating professionals is to develop skills, concepts and insights needed on the job. One must aim for maximum transfer of learning to future on-the-job situations, and it is at this point that simulated materials may have particular relevance in education.

According to Dawson (1962) and Twelker (1968a), the teaching and training potential of man-simulation, in particular, is very good. Learning is not confined to the actual playing of the game, but can take place at every stage of the simulation sequence:

1. During the data collecting stage;
2. While the field situation is being analyzed;
3. While the exercise is being designed;
4. While the exercise is being run;
5. During the post-game analysis.

Psychologists have demonstrated that learning transfer occurs when the learner perceives a relationship between a given situation and one which he has experienced previously.

Since simulation presents representations of real situations, the likelihood of desired transfer would seem much more probable with them than with conventional materials and methods, (Culbertson, 1960). Twelker (1967) noted considerable instances of learning transfer in Kersh's (1963) use of simulation in the preparation of student teachers.

A closely related issue, and one which requires further study, is whether or not the behavior in simulated situations is truly representative of on-the-job situations.

Another question often raised about the value of simulation and the chance for maximum transfer of training is the realism of the actual model. Hudson (1968), Twelker (1967), Vlcek (1965), Hammerton (1963), and Briggs and Naylor (1965) agree that transfer of training is more likely to occur if the simulated experiences used in training are relevant to the real world and are meaningful in terms of goals. Kraft (1967) argues strongly against learning games as being non-realistic because the operations performed in many games are not typical or representative of real life, in terms of the actual complexities of real situations. Adams (1962), on the other hand, believes that realism in simulation is not as an important a variable in enhancing transfer as instructor differences and length of training. He maintains that the importance of realism in the reproduction of the stimulus and the realism of the required response has shown no relationship between stimulus or response precision and transfer of learning.

Meir (1961) and Scott, Lucas and Lucas (1966) agree, in essence, on the methodology for creating satisfying simulation involving human participation:

1. Identification of a salient problem.
2. Completion of thorough-going case studies which isolate the system, the major variables, and the key decision points.
3. Demonstration that the dynamics system cannot be adequately described by simple logical or mathematical formulations; in other words, it must be shown that the relationships are not simple, but complex, and the outcomes are predictable.
4. A team must be formed, combining researcher, practitioner, and programmer, which organizes elements of the exercise for one of the following purposes: training of personnel, measurement of human capability, decision-making, research in group processes, display of interactions within a complex system, therapy, or recreation.

5. The program is put to trial, and the rules of the game are adjusted so as to remove defects and make progress toward the self-assigned ends.
6. The standard players are introduced into the roles so that the scores obtained are comparable and can be correlated with other individual or group characteristics, thus connecting the findings with the main body of psychology, industrial engineering, administration, etc.
7. The successful result is embodied in a curriculum, training program, sequence of investigation, or therapeutic program which exploits its potentials for creating organization.

Summary

Simulation is not new as a research tool nor as a training technique. It is one means of studying problems and behavior in decision-making, exploring theories, and testing hypotheses.

Realism in the simulator model is believed to be necessary in order for the participant to get the feel of the real-life situation and an indication of the possible outcome of his actions and responses.

Simulation has seen a wide variety of uses in research, testing and training, in almost all phases of human endeavor. Only recently, however, has it been applied to social systems. Among its greatest advantages are the high degree of motivation and interest it stimulates, and the fact that it allows the participant to experience constructive failure and to profit from his mistakes. Of course, simulation has its limitations. Among the most basic objections are the expense of production, the length of time needed, and the question of transferability of training.

CHAPTER III

MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT

The simulation material developed was designed to enable both students and practitioners, experienced and inexperienced, to assume the role of Director of the Bureau for Handicapped Children of the State Education Department in the simulated State of Lafayette.

The material was designed to be reality-based, meaning that the simulation exercise was developed from actual occurrences in administration settings in various state agencies. In order to make this a reality-based exercise, the cooperation of the state agencies was needed. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education was approached at its annual 1969 summer meeting in Jackson, Mississippi, and the members were asked to participate in the development and evaluation of the simulation materials. The membership expressed a general willingness to take part in the project. The manner of participation included:

1. Providing the investigator with copies of
    a. administrative organizational structure (charts, job descriptions, etc.) showing the relationships both within their units concerned with

the handicapped and relationships between other units of the state education agency;

b. their most recent publications containing the statutes and administrative regulations;

c. any other materials which they felt would be a useful contribution to the background data for the proposed simulator.

2. Allowing advanced doctoral students, majoring in administration of Special Education, to visit their units for approximately two or three days during January of 1970 for the purpose of gathering more information. Budgetary considerations and available field observers limited the number of site visits that could be made. It was determined that nine states would be selected for the site visits from among those indicating a willingness to participate. States would be selected in order to provide a cross section containing large and small states, densely and sparsely populated, having well-developed and staffed state agencies for exceptional child education, as well as those with modest resources, and representing a wide range of geographic sectional characteristics. A form was developed to be used for

observing and recording all significant problems.

3. Maintaining an activity log focusing on an inventory of problems faced on-the-job. (This aspect was used only in states not receiving site visits.)
4. Nominating the newest professional staff member in their unit to attend a two week workshop to be held at Syracuse University during June 1970, for the purpose of evaluation.

Development of Background Materials

The background material was developed so as to provide a framework from which the participant in the simulation exercise could become oriented to the role of Dale O. Ames, the newly appointed State Director of the Bureau for Handicapped Children, Lafayette Education Department. The background material was based on similar publications, reports, etc. from those made available to the researcher from state agencies. Table 1 shows the number of state agencies which supplied background material as well as other aspects of participation in the total project.

In insuring that the material developed would not be representative of extremes in demographic dimensions, all

Table 1

Level of Participation of State Education Agencies

Manner of Participation	Number of States Participating
Furnished materials	29
Supplied Reporting Forms--December	20
Supplied Reporting Forms--January	22
Visited by doctoral students from Syracuse University	9
Participants sent to institute	21
No response of any kind	8

figures and other data, extrapolated from materials submitted, were based on a state which would rank 25th out of the 50 on the variables presented. The variables examined included population, land mass, school population and wealth. The State of Lafayette then became a composite of the states in the United States, with the result that no particular state served as a prototype for the development of the background materials. Materials submitted by the state agencies were extensively reviewed. All publications and reports included in the background materials are representative of the materials made available to the writer and are typical of those found in state education agencies serving handicapped children.

One publication, entitled "Administrative Guidelines for the Education of Handicapped Children in the State of Lafayette" (see Appendix A), provided the participants with information on such topics as: the legal authority in the state, definitions of handicapped children, reimbursement, teacher certification, the Lafayette Schools for the Blind and Deaf, regulations of the Commissioner of Education, transportation, listing of agencies and organizations offering services for handicapped children, and Title VIa, ESEA guidelines and procedures. After reviewing this publication, the participants should have a basis for evaluating the legal provisions for services for handicapped children in Lafayette.

In order for the participants to obtain an understanding of the school population in the State of Lafayette, the "Annual Status Report on Programs for Handicapped Children in Lafayette 1969-1970" was developed (see Appendix A). The report contains such information as the number of instructional units serving handicapped children, the number of children needing Special Education programs, and the number of children receiving services in state schools for the deaf and blind. After reviewing this document, the participants should be able to make a rough estimation of the strengths and weaknesses of services for handicapped children in Lafayette.

A third publication developed was the State Plan for funding of personnel training under the provisions of Public Law 85-926, as amended. States wishing to receive funds under this law for training of Special Education personnel must annually submit a plan as to how they will spend the funds authorized. The allocation to each state is determined on the basis of its population. The population of Lafayette is approximately 3,200,000 resulting in an allocation of $150,000 for the fiscal year 1970.

In addition to these three major references, other miscellaneous material was prepared to be presented with the background materials. These included such items as evaluation forms of the personnel within the Bureau for Handicapped Children, a copy of the minutes of the last staff meeting held by the Bureau under the previous director, and other varied written communications. All of these background materials were designed to be presented to the participants in an "Orientation Packet" which serves to give them a frame of reference from which they may later make decisions.

In order to supplement the written materials, two video-tape presentations were developed. Both presentations were designed to be included in the orientation phase of the simulation exercise. The first video-tape presentation consisted of a staff meeting of the Bureau for Handicapped Children, which had been held prior to Dale O. Ames joining the staff, but at which he is a passive observer. This gives the role player a feel for some of the personalities and issues with which he will be dealing. In this presentation, several obvious problems in the Bureau surfaced and reinforced those which were already detectable in the "Orientation Packet."

Another video-tape presentation consisted of "an interview with the boss," in which the participants listened to a three minute monologue by the boss, Dr. Strang, after which the participants were instructed to respond verbally to the monologue. This particular video-tape presentation was designed to be open ended in that it enabled the participants to responde, after the interview, to some specific questions asked by Dr. Strang in his monologue. Provisions were made for recording all participant responses with an audio-tape recorder.

Development of Task Materials

The reality-based task items were collected from the state education agencies by using two separate methods. Nine states received site visits, and the directors of the remainder of those states which had agreed to participate in the study were sent a form for recording their activities.

Advanced doctoral students majoring in Special Education Administration, made two or three day site visits to nine selected state education agency units for handicapped children during the week of January 26, 1970. These states were Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. States were selected for the site visits so that the data collected would represent a cross section containing large and small states, densely and sparsely populated, having well-developed and staffed agencies for handicapped child education, as well as those with modest resources, and representing a wide range of geographic sectional characteristics.

An interview schedule and observation form (see Appendix B) were developed and used to record all significant problems of professional personnel in state education agencies. An orientation session was held for the doctoral students making the site visits prior to the actual visits. During this session the State Department Observation Form was discussed in detail so that they would be thoroughly familiar with it. The form contains two separate sections: one for observing the activities in the unit visited, and the other for interviewing staff members.

The interview schedule of the form was developed from the study done by Mackie and Snyder (1956), which outlined twelve major areas of responsibility for state directors of Special Education. The writer then adjusted, modified, and expanded those twelve areas into fifteen areas, which are:

1. Selecting Personnel for the Unit
2. Supervision of Unit Personnel
3. Preparing the Budget
4. Preparing Publications
5. Maintaining Inter-agency Relationships
6. Legislation
7. Establishing and Maintaining Standards
8. Distributing State Funds
9. U.S.O.E. Funds
10. Sponsoring and Directing Research
11. Fostering and Improving Local Programs
12. Encouraging In-service Growth of Professional Personnel
13. Recruiting, Training and Certification of Instructional Personnel

14. Residential Schools
15. Supervision and/or Administration of Programs for Handicapped Children in the Private Sector

Assuming that the field observers could not be guaranteed that they would be given sufficient time to complete the interview schedule, the pages of the nine forms were randomized so that no topic would be left last on all the State Director Observation Forms. The data resulting from the site visits substantiated this concern in that in only six of the nine states was the interviewer able to complete the extensive interview schedule.

The field observer did not have any set time in which to interview the state directors of Special Education. In some states, the state director spent as little as an hour with the field observer, while in others the state director spent as much as three working days with the field observer. Since it appeared that there was no continuity to the data collected from these visits, it was decided not to attempt to classify the information, but to use it as a source from which actual in-basket items could later be developed. The method employed in the creation of the in-basket items will be discussed later in this chapter.

The second method employed to collect data from the state education agencies involved the development of an instrument for professional employees to use in recording their activities for one working day.

The State Department Reporting System (S.D.R.S.) consists of three sections--the instruction page, the sample form, and the reporting form itself (see Appendix C). The S.D.R.S. was mailed to those state agencies not receiving a site visit, but which had earlier indicated agreement to participate in this portion of the study. In order to gain a perspective of the function of the entire unit, two forms were sent to the participating states on two separate occasions. Forms were mailed in December 1969 and in January 1970. One form was sent to the state director of Special Education, and another was sent to a randomly selected, professional subordinate from the same unit. The random selection of names was made from the 1970 Directory of Special Education Personnel in State Education Agencies.

A total of 27 states were sent the S.D.R.S. form to complete. Of the forms mailed in December, at least one reply was received from 20 states. At least one response was obtained from 22 states as a result of the January mailing. As the replies were received, the specific activities reported were placed on individual 5 x 7 cards, and any indication of proper names was removed. A total number of 812 specific activities were developed from the data collected. The cards were then shuffled so that any indication of the origin of the card was eliminated.

Item Classification

A process analysis model was then developed for classifying the task items. The process analysis model consisted of three separate parts:

1. Activity (doing what)
2. Co-respondent (with whom--source or recipient of interaction)
3. Content (regarding what)

Each part of the model had its own sections. They are as follows:

1. Activity (Doing What)
    a. Communicating - (Information input-output, by telephone, letter, memo, report form, to another person or office, involving only information exchange.)

    b. Consulting--(Discussing, having lunch with, giving-receiving advice, interviewing preparatory to deciding, with one or few other persons at a time.)

    c. Participating - (Attending meeting of staff, committee, larger group, as one of many.)

    d. Reviewing - (Evaluating, studying, planning proposals, ideas, projects; visiting, observing classes, preparatory to deciding; also monitoring, checking, after deciding.)

e. Deciding - (Selecting, choosing, approving materials, personnel, programs, etc.)

f. Securing - (Collecting, hiring, purchasing.)

g. Disseminating - (Publishing, speaking to groups, instructing.)

2. Co-Respondent (With Whom--Source or Recipient of Interaction

a. Intra-Bureau - (Staff of own office)

b. Inter-Bureau - (Other bureaus of SEA, other departments of Executive branch at state level, State Residential schools, IMC, Governmental Advisory Committee, etc.)

c. State Government VIP - (Governor, State & U.S. Legislative and Judicial Branch)

d. Federal Agencies - (Bureaus of Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Labor, etc.)

e. Local Agencies - (School District personnel, local public health, welfare agencies, local clinics, Regional Title III)

f. Higher Education - (Personnel training institutions, personnel in training, college students)

g. Private Sector - (Schools, services agencies, lay groups, Professional Associations, e. g. Mental Health Association, ARC, etc.)

h. Information Media - (Newspapers, radio, TV, magazines, journals, newsletters)

i. Supplier - (Commercial firms, publishers)

j. Clients - (Individual or parent of child who is direct recipient of services)

3. Content (Regarding What)

    a. Services - (Instructional or ancillary program, curriculum, methods)

    b. Personnel - (Bureau or Field, recruiting, training, development, conventions, workshops)

    c. Materials - (Instructional materials, aids, small equipment, publications)

    d. Facilities - (Buildings, transportation, capital equipment, pupil accounting, statistical reports)

    e. Funds - (Budgets, audits, reimbursement claims, all projects involving special grants, where funding is key factor; allotments of units, financial reports)

    f. Laws and Regulations - (New legislation, regulations, standards, guidelines)

    g. Public and Professional Relations - (Social, lunch, fence mending, with lay or professional groups where lubrication is key factor)

The data were then collected from the returns of the two mailings. Doctoral students majoring in Special Education Administration then classified the responses into the three categories of the process analysis model described earlier.

Tabulation of the results of the classification of the task activity items on the dimensions of the process analysis model are illustrated in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

The respondents were asked to complete the forms on "the next business day" after they received the S.D.R.S. forms

Table 2

Distribution of Task Activity Items into Activity Dimension of Process Analysis Model

Activity (Doing What)	Percent of Items Listed
Communicating	38
Consulting	36
Participating	7
Reviewing	12
Deciding	3
Securing	1
Disseminating	3

Table 3

Distribution of Task Activity Items into Co-Respondent Dimension of Process Analysis Model

Co-Respondent (With Whom--Source or Recipient of Interaction)	Percent of Items Listed
Intra-Bureau	17
Inter-Bureau	23
State Government VIP	2
Federal Agencies	1
Local Agencies	36
Higher Education	7
Private Sector	6
Information Media	3
Supplier	2
Clients	3

Table 4

Distribution of Task Activity Items into Content Dimension of Process Analysis Model

Content (Regarding What)	Percent of Items Listed
Services	31
Personnel	22
Materials	6
Facilities	4
Funds	24
Laws and Regulations	9
Public and Professional Relations	4

in both the December and January mailings. However, the returning forms were received as much as sixty days after being sent out, which suggests that the request was not completely complied with. It would also seem to indicate that the respondents may have completed the forms on those days that were more convenient. That the data is actually representative of the activities of state education agencies should therefore be considered with the utmost caution. An additional factor detracting from complete acceptance of this data as representative is that it was only collected during the months of December and January, and not over the entire year. Given the above limitations, the data was considered to be an adequate basis for use in the development of the simulation in-basket items.

Development of Reality-Based In-Basket Items

The items collected with the written instrument and from the site visits were combined into an item pool. The item pool was supplemented by actual copies of correspondence, memos, and publications that the states either sent in with the S.D.R.S. form or gave to the field observers during the site visits.

From the pool of task items and supplemental correspondence, the reality-based in-basket items were developed.

Eighty-three in-basket items were eventually included as part of the simulation exercise. The in-basket items took the form of letters, memos, and bulletins. Some representative samples of written reality-based in-basket items are included in Appendix D.

The writer selected those items which, in his judgment, contained pressing issues for the field of Special Education. As an item was selected, it was modified, adjusted and/or expanded as needed in order to provide continuity in the simulation exercise and in order to blend with the background materials previously developed. It was important to insure that little redundancy appeared in the materials. Extreme caution was taken, also, to guarantee that complete anonymity was preserved. All original copies of correspondence, memos, and other items were destroyed after the task material was developed.

As in-basket items were developed, care was taken to have the materials follow as closely as possible the obtained percentage in the classification of items collected from the field. The first dimension of the process analysis model is the Activity (doing what) dimension. It was impossible to ascertain in advance exactly how the role-player would handle any one task. It was therefore possible only to follow the last two dimensions of the process analysis model--those of Co-Respondent and Content--using problem input as the basis for classification in developing the in-basket items. Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the degree to which the reality-based in-basket items compare with the collected task items. As indicated in Tables 5 and 6, the percentages of the collected activity items and in-basket items do not always agree. However, the variation is not great. In developing the in-basket items, it was impossible to follow the exact percentage of the collected activity items for several reasons. Although a collected activity item might be classified in one category on both the Co-Respondent and Content dimensions of the process analysis model, an in-basket item might be classified differently in order to be placed in the context of the Lafayette Education Department. Also, a collected activity item may have been classified intra-bureau on the Co-Respondent dimension, but due to a variance between the actual state education agency and the Lafayette Education Department the in-basket item was classified in the inter-bureau category. Other variances of obtained percentages between collected activity items and in-basket items are by design. On the Co-Respondent dimension (Table 5), the private sector category only accounted for 6 percent of the

Table 5

Comparison of Collected Activity Items with In-Basket Items Included in the Simulation Exercise on the Co-Respondent Dimension of the Process Analysis Model

Co-Respondent (With Whom-- Source of Interaction)	Percentage of Collected Activity Items	Percentage of In-Basket Items
Intra-Bureau	17	18
Inter-Bureau	23	22
State Government VIP	2	2
Federal Agencies	1	1
Local Agencies	37	29
Higher Education	7	4
Private Sector	6	12
Information Media	3	0
Supplies	2	0
Clients	3	12

Table 6

Comparison of Collected Activity Items with In-Basket Items Included in the Simulation Exercise on the Content Dimension of the Process Analysis Model

Content (Regarding What)	Percentage of Collected Activity Items	Percentage of In-Basket Items
Services	31	29
Personnel	22	18
Materials	6	0
Facilities	4	8
Funds	24	21
Laws and Regulations	9	18
Public and Professional Relations	4	6

obtained activity items, while the private sector accounted for 12 percent of the in-basket items. States are increasingly passing new legislation for handicapped children, and the writer developed several in-basket items to guarantee that this emerging trend was covered in the simulated setting.

The total package is so designed as to hopefully predict that certain issues and problems will develop from the in-basket items. An example of this is the in-basket items C-33, C-46, C-48 and C-38 in the November 15th packet which all focus on the function of the Bureau for Handicapped Children in the area of legislation.

Development of Supplemental Simulation Material

In order to provide other modes of communication activities, supplemental materials other than the written in-basket type were developed. These supplemental materials consisted of phone call scripts, role-play scripts and other special activities.

In all, eight, one-sided phone call scripts were developed, based on the situations from the pool of task items described earlier. The phone calls were designed to be made to Dale O. Ames while he was at work on the various written in-basket phases. The calls were made by a role-player who, in an attempt to standardize the situation as much as possible, spoke from the script. The scripts were so designed as to have the role-player present a problem to Dale without much time, on Dale's part, for interruption. In an attempt to provide the role-player with guidelines for responding to possible questions and statements for the remainder of the call, a set of possible secondary responses was included. A sample script is found in Appendix E.

In addition to the phone call scripts described above, other phone call situations were designed to provide intra-simulation feedback. Phone call scripts were created so that Dale could experience the consequences for decisions he had made. Typical of these is one designed to provide feedback for Dale's response to in-basket item C-35. No matter how he responded to this item, he received a phone call from a belligerent indicating his disapproval of Dale's action. If Dale had taken no formal action, he would still receive a phone call. A set of role scripts for this situation is found in Appendix E.

Additional supplemental material was developed in the form of role-playing scripts that could be used in a variety of situations, such as staff meetings, task force meetings, and federal funding advisory boards. These scripts were one or two paragraph character sketches which established for the participant, a name, title and professional point of view about relevant issues in the field of Special Education for the role to be played. By developing scripts that were general in nature, the scripts could be used for a variety of group role-playing situations. Of the scripts developed for this simulation exercise were those for personnel from the Bureau for Handicapped Children, training institutions in the state, and administrative personnel from local education agencies. All together fifteen such scripts were produced. A sample role script from each of the three groups mentioned is contained in Appendix F.

Utilizing the role-play scripts discussed above, several special activities were designed to be utilized as a part of the simulation exercise. These included such activities as:

1. Instructions for organizing the Standards Committee which is charged with recommending new regulations for the educationally handicapped;
2. Instructions for organizing and initiating work on the Special Study Institute for Administration of Special Education;
3. Instructions for development of the new state plan for P.L. 91-230, Part D.

4. Instructions for the exercise designed to study the possibility of joint planning for personnel training among the training institutions, the state education agency, and local administrative personnel.

A sample set of this material is included in Appendix G.

Following up on the recommendation made by Weinberger (1968) that a "how-to-do-it" manual is greatly needed, an instructional manual was developed for this exercise. In addition to including a copy of all background material and in-basket items in the exercise, the manual has a section in each training phase to orient the participants to the time sequence in the simulation, and what is expected of them in each phase (see Appendix G). Instructions for supplemental work sessions, such as the group role-playing situations, were also included in the instructor's manual.

Response material was also developed for use by the participants. The material included such items as memo forms, letter head stationery, and reaction forms. The reaction form was designed to provide a record of what the participant did with each in-basket item and why he did it (see Appendix H).

Summary

This chapter has discussed the collecting of the reality-based items, the scoring of the items, and the development of the State Education Agency Simulation Exercise (SEASE).

The SEASE is organized into five separate packets, each one being a specific day during the first year on the job for Dale O. Ames. The first packet is dated August 23, 1970, which is Dale's first day as Director of the Bureau for Handicapped Children, State of Lafayette Education Department. The second packet is dated September 15, 1970; the third is dated November 15, 1970, and the fourth January 20, 1971. The fifth and final packet is dated May 12, 1971.

Certain in-basket items were designed and specifically placed in order to lead the participant into some of the supplemental special activities described earlier. One such item (B-11) points out the lack of state regulations for the category of educationally handicapped children. This leads logically to a special group activity designed to have participants develop these regulations.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF THE SIMULATION MATERIALS

The major purpose of this chapter is to describe 1) the participants who took part in the evaluation phase of the study and the method of their selection; 2) the workshop activities; and 3) the methods of evaluating the SEASE exercise, including the development of the measures employed and their application.

The pilot implementation of the State Education Agency Simulation Exercise (SEASE), heretofore described, was scheduled for the weeks of June 15 through 26, 1970. Invitations to all 50 states to nominate participants were mailed during the week of April 27, 1970. The letter of invitation specifically requested that the state agency nominate for the institute the person with the least experience in the unit. In some rare cases, the newest person may have been the state director himself. The invitation also indicated that the state could nominate an individual who was not yet on the job. The final selection of the participants was to be made on the basis of those applicants with the least administrative experience in state education agencies.

Subjects

Twenty-two participants were selected to attend a pilot workshop of the SEASE exercise during June 15 through 26, 1970. Since the number of applications did not exceed the space available (twenty-five), no formal selection process was exercised. All applicants who applied were extended an invitation to attend the workshop. A list of the participants and their states is found in Appendix I.

Table 7 shows the experience in state education agencies of each subject at the time of the workshop. This information was obtained from the applications forms completed by all the participants (see Appendix J).

Of the six participants who had no administrative experience in state educational agencies prior to the workshop, one was to be assigned as an administrative intern to a state education agency, and the other five were in the process of reporting to their jobs in various states. One of the individuals in this group was to assume the position as a state director as soon as the workshop was completed.

The remaining sixteen subjects were incumbent employees of state education agencies. All but one of the sixteen were consultant level employees, the exception being one participant who was a state director. In addition to the 22 subjects,

Table 7

Months of Administrative Experience in State Education Agencies

Length of Experience	Number of Participants
0	6
1 - 6 months	3
7 -12 months	9
1 to 4 years	4

three graduate students in Special Education Administration attended the workshop as participant observers, but they were not considered part of the population for analysis purposes. One of the twenty-two subjects had been exposed to one of the evaluation instruments prior to the workshop, and therefore his responses could not be considered in the data analysis of that portion.

All of the subjects had earned master's degrees, with the exception of one individual. Table 8 shows the areas of master's degree training for the subjects.

It is interesting to note that the majority of the subjects had three semester hours or less in Special Education Administration even though they were all employed or were about to be employed as practitioners in Special Education Administration on the state level. This data would tend to support the need for training programs such as the one herein described.

Table 9 shows the distribution of graduate and undergraduate hours in Special Education Administration.

The subjects did have, however, considerably more Special Education teaching than supervision and/or administrative experience. Tables 10 and 11 show the experience of the subjects in these areas. One could possible conclude from

Table 8

Master's Degree Major of Subjects

Master's Degree Major	Number of Subjects
General Education	0
Special Education (Handicapped)	13
Educational Administration	4
Psychology	1
Other	3
No Degree	1

Table 9

Graduate and Undergraduate Hours in Special Education Administration

Semester Hours	Number of Participants
0 - 3	13
4 - 12	7
13 - 21	0
22 - 30	0
over 30	2

Table 10

Professional Experience of Subjects in Special Education Teaching

Years of Experience	Number of Subjects
0	3
1 - 4	12
5 - 9	4
over 9	3

Table 11

Professional Experience of Subjects in Special Education Supervision or Administration

Years of Experience	Number of Subjects
0	5
1 - 4	14
5 - 9	2
over 9	0

this information that administrators at the state level are chosen more for their technological knowledge and teaching experience than for training in Special Education Administration.

Since the total project was endorsed by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education and participants' attendance was financed by federal funds, it was of interest to know how much choice the participants had in attending the workshop. Table 12 shows the circumstances of the subjects' attendance at the workshop.

It could be interpreted from this data, that only two subjects has been "sent" to the workshop, while the remainder came of their own choice. This information was collected anonymously at the close of the workshop.

Description of the Workshop

The workshop was conducted for ten working days, with Saturday and Sunday off on the middle weekend. The daily schedule was from 9 A. M. until 4 P. M. A copy of the workshop schedule appears in Appendix K.

All of the participants except one were housed in a motel adjacent to the Syracuse University campus.

The workshop was held at the Newhouse Communications Center at Syracuse University. The room utilized for the simulation exercise contained desks with individual telephones

Table 12

Circumstances of Subjects' Attendance at the Workshop

Type of Circumstances	Number of Subjects
Agency's direction, with little chance for deciding	2
Agency's offer, but with freedom of choice	15
With permission of agency, but primarily on the subject's own volition	5

for each of the participants. The telephones can be dialed from a central booth in an adjoining room which contained two phones and two tape decks for recording all phone conversations.

The simulation exercises and supplemental materials were interspersed with other activities during the two week workshop. Included in these activities were pre-planned lecture-discussions which were designed to grow out of prior in-basket problems.

The interspacing of other activities appeared to present no problems for the simulation exercise, as the only requirement is that the simulation activities be presented sequentially and that the participants have sufficient time to complete work created by the in-basket items.

Following is a brief outline of the on-going activities of the workshop, together with the total number of hours spent on each type of activity. Approximately 5 1/2 to 6 hours--from 9 A. M. to 3:30 or 4 P. M.--each of the nine days and two hours on the last day were spent on workshop activities. The total number of working hours was 52.

Activities of the Workshop

1. Orientation	7 hours
a. Establishing procedures	
b. Organizing work	

c. Testing (pre- and post-)

d. Final Evaluation

2. Study of Background Material 4 hours

3. Lecture-Discussions and Presentations 9 hours

   a. The Administrative Process: Role and Organizational Variables

   b. Future Forecasting and Long Range Planning

   c. Criteria for Program Evaluation

   d. Analysis of Group Roles

   e. A Model for Analyzing Problem Solving Behavior

   f. Identifying Legislative Needs and Processes

   g. Facilities as Reflections of Program Philosophy

   h. Simulation as a Tool for Personnel Training

4. Work Sessions in Role

   a. Responding to written and phone in-put 11 hours

   b. Group planning and problem solving exercises 11 hours

      1) Committee to Develop Regulations to Implement Educationally Handicapped Laws
      2) Committee to Develop a Special Study Institute for Administrators
      3) Committee to Develop Reactions to Proposed Legislation
      4) Joint Agency Planning--New Model for Personnel Training
      5) Joint Agency Planning--Future Forecasting and Long Range Planning

5. Feedback Discussions on Workshop Sessions Attempting to Focus on Identification of Issues 10 hours

Total 52 hours

Evaluation

As indicated in Chapter I, the evaluation of the first two objectives of this study were inherent within the development of the SEASE exercise as they became operationally demonstrable. The first two objectives were:

1. To develop a set of reality-based items based on observed situations in state education agencies;
2. To develop a training model utilizing such items within a simulated environment approach.

Evaluation of the third objective, to assess the viability of the training model and to determine its effect on the trainees in the skill areas of information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning, was based on three approaches which were administered during the two week workshop, using instruments prepared for that purpose.

Development of Evaluation Instruments

An interview schedule was developed to ascertain if the subject's perspectives of Special Education Administration had changed as a result of attending the workshop, and to get their opinions as to the viability of the simulation approach and the entire workshop itself. The instrument was adapted from one designed for a similar purpose by Burke and Sage (1970).

A copy of the interview schedule is included in Appendix L. The interview schedule was so designed that a trained interviewer could use the instrument with a group of five or six subjects, tape recording the responses to all of the questions from all of the subjects willing to contribute.

A written opinionnaire was developed to be completed by the participants at the close of the workshop. The opinionnaire was designed to survey the general value of the simulation exercise, to invite comparisons to other methods of administrative training, recommendations as to the placement of various parts of the total simulation packet, and the relative value of various parts. The opinionnaire also attempted to measure the subject's reactions to the various supplemental activities of the workshop. A copy of the opinionnaire is found in Appendix M. The instrument consisted of 17 questions, each having four to six possible responses. The SEASE opinionnaire is similar to that used by Weinberger (1965) in his study, as modified by Sage (1967).

A third evaluation instrument, the Trial Problem Solving Exercise, was developed for the purpose of measuring the three growth variables--information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizational planning. The instrument was developed over a series of trial runs with advanced doctoral students in Special Education Administration serving as a pilot group. The instrument, developed in two alternative forms, was based on in-basket items (see Appendix N). It was designed so that a subject could be presented with a hypothetical problem and asked how he would handle that problem. The instrument was divided into sections so that a subject, after reviewing the problem, could request further information before attempting to solve the problem. After indicating what information he would need, the participant was then supplied with the additional information. The participant was subsequently asked what issues he saw in that problem and what planning and organizing he would attempt to bring about solution seeking.

The two problems presented in the instrument were judged by the investigators to be representative of those facing the Special Education administrator at the state level.

Initially, it was thought that the verbal responses of the subjects could be scored by comparison with a normative group of incumbent administrators in state education agencies. A modified form of the two instruments was developed so as to provide a series of alternatives which, in the judgment of the investigators, were the most logical responses that would be made to the instrument by typical subjects.

with each response, a Likert type scale was provided, so that the subjects in the normative group could indicate their judgment of the degree of importance of each item on the instrument. In addition to the set of "most logical responses," blank spaces were included to provide an opportunity for the respondents to indicate any additional responses which they also felt were appropriate. The two alternative forms of this modified instrument were sent to thirty-six incumbent administrators of Special Education in state education agencies.

In reviewing the data from that group, it became obvious that there was little variance in the importance ascribed to the various alternatives by these respondents and that the power of the items as discriminators was therefore minimal. The actual data from the subjects in the workshop population, as it was later revealed, did not correspond closely to the previously anticipated most logical responses. In view of this, and given the lack of discrimination shown on the Likert scale, it was decided that the data from the incumbent administrators would not be usable as a standard against which to evaluate the workshop group. It was decided instead to develop an evaluation mechanism for this particular instrument directly from the workshop group responses.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate a reality-based simulation model of the role of a Special Education administrator in a state education agency. The development of the simulation model was presented in Chapter III, and the procedure for evaluation of the simulation model was presented in Chapter IV. This chapter contains a description of the analysis techniques employed and the results of the evaluation of the materials carried out in the pilot application of the materials in the workshop. Three measures were employed--the interview schedule, the opinionnaire, and the pre- and post- use of the two forms of the trial problem solving exercise.

Results of the Workshop Interview Schedule

On the last day of the workshop, four interviewers met with four groups, consisting of from four to six participants for approximately 45 minutes. The sessions were tape-recorded. However, due to technical difficulties, all of the data from one group was not recorded.

At the beginning of the interview, the participants were asked, "Recalling your perspective, beliefs, and feeling toward administration of Special Education programs at the state level prior to this workshop, has anything changed as a result of your participation? And if anything has changed, what will you do about it?"

Most of the subjects' comments focused on the belief that they had gained a broader perspective, were able to see more aspects to the job, the "total picture" rather than isolated tasks. Others commented on having developed channels for maneuvering, getting a better idea of how committee process works, and gaining respect for the director.

In answer to the more specific question, "Do you now have a better understanding of the issues and problems in administration of Special Education programs at the state level?" the comments were primarily quite positive. They felt that the workshop had helped them to see the depths and implications of some of the problems in Special Education. One subject suggested that he had been ready to resign after the first few hours, but after a couple of days he felt he had acquired some tools and regained confidence. Another commented that "It was learning around the clock."

Another direct question was "Given that you can identify the major problems and issues, has this workshop given you any ideas on how to bring about change, relative to solving these problems?" A synthesis of responses lists the problem solving model and the legislative hearing as most informative. One subject felt that state education agencies ought "to channel in-service education programs in this direction to get down to the big issues." Another subject complained about the lack of general philosophy and guidelines, to which a third responded that perhaps this could not be done because each state is different.

The second part of the interview schedule was concerned with the evaluation of the simulation approach. The first question asked, "Was this simulation experience effective or could time have been spent more efficiently in a different type activity?" The majority of participants felt that simulation was an extremely effective learning technique. Many, however, complained about the short amount of time allowed for each activity. They felt that perhaps too much was covered in too little time, not allowing enough thoughtful analysis of any one problem or situation.

The final question on the Workshop Interview Schedule was "Given that it may be possible to conduct other workshops of a similar nature in the future, with another group of administrators of Special Education at the state level, what would you like to see included and/or deleted in such an endeavor?"

Some suggestions included doing away with the videotape interview as being unrealistic, having a secretary to call for supportive information, more time for each activity, more specific feedback, shortening the workshop from ten days to six days, using the SEASE with local directors so that they could gain insight into problems at the state level, and using the SEASE in conjunction with field work, i.e. in-service training for incumbent personnel.

Results of the Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire was administered to the subjects on the last day of the workshop. It was designed to elicit feedback from the participants so that future simulation workshops could be improved upon. The results of the seventeen item instrument are illustrated in Appendix M.

The items on the opinionnaire were designed to obtain value judgments on the overall worth of the workshop, and so that data could be gathered to determine which aspects of the workshop could be improved upon.

The results of the opinionnaire indicate that the majority of the subjects felt that "in terms of time spent on follow-up discussion of the simulation material, discussion was not quite enough." Almost half of the group felt that in terms of the total time spent on simulation activities versus other workshop content, the emphasis on simulation was a little too much. Eleven subjects felt that it was about right, or that they could have had more.

In response to the question which asked how the simulation approach could be enhanced, eight of the subjects indicated that greater use of "oral communication situations, were needed. Four felt that "role playing situations" should be increased, and four indicated that "greater pictorial input" was needed. Fifteen of the subjects suggested that "somewhat more" background data was needed as a pre-requisite to problem-solving activities.

In response to the question which asked for what group of people would this workshop be best suited, fifteen of the subjects felt that it would be most appropriate for administrators beginning in Special Education units in state education agencies. Six of the subjects indicated that it would be best for incumbent state directors of Special Education programs.

Several questions were concerned with specific training segments of the workshop. Twelve subjects indicated that they thought that the legislative work session was very realistic and a valuable experience, and ten felt that it was realistic and a valuable experience. In evaluating the "future planning" aspect, four subjects indicated that it was extremely worthwhile, ten indicated it was worthwhile, and eight said that it was possibly worthwhile.

In determining the overall value of the workshop experience, several questions were asked. Eighteen of the subjects felt that the simulation approach was a "highly appropriate and valuable approach," three felt it was a "better than average approach," and one said it was "no better nor no worse than any other approach." In response to the question about the overall value of the workshop, fifteen subjects said that it was "extremely worthwhile" and seven said it was "worthwhile."

Results of the Trial Problem Solving Exercise

As indicated in Chapter IV, it was originally planned that responses of incumbent state directors would serve as a normative base for an objective scoring system for the workshop participants" responses to this instrument. Since this basis proved to be insufficiently discriminating in evaluating the subjects' responses, it became necessary to examine the responses prior to the development of an adequate scoring method.

The investigators grouped the responses to the T.P.S.E., so that it was not possible to tell which were the pre- and which were the post-. Responses were then reviewed by the investigators, and categories were concommitantly developed for scoring the three dimensions of both forms of the instrument. The categories that were finally developed (see Appendix O) were sufficiently discrete to discriminate between the responses made by the subjects. The categories were created by the pattern of the subjects' responses. By constantly reviewing and modifying the responses, the investigators created scoring categories for all the dimensions of the instrument.

In addition to the scoring categories that were developed, for each form, a cover sheet of ground rules for scoring were also created. All of the ground rules came about through the same method as did the scoring categories--by constantly reviewing and modifying. They served as a vehicle for answering questions that came up in the scoring of the T.P.S.E. The guidelines for scoring were finally judged by the investigators as being an accurate reflection of the categories.

Scoring of the instrument consisted of assigning one point to each response that was identified with a scoring category, thus enabling the investigators to obtain a numerical score for each subject's response. An example of how this would work can be illustrated by examining the issues section of the Form A scoring guide. If the subject had Issues #1, #2 and #5 on his form, he would receive a score of three on the Issues Dimension of the instrument.

The scoring was done by two raters. The raters were advanced doctoral students in Special Education Administration, and were also familiar with the SEASE exercise. The raters received a brief training session prior to the scoring of the results.

Both raters scored both forms of the instrument without knowing which was pre- and which was post-. Prior to the final scoring by the raters, a flip of a coin determined which results were to be used from the rater. Rater #1 was assigned the odd numerical subjects and rater #2 the even numerical subjects. The percentage of inter-rater agreement is illustrated in Table 13.

The process of analysis consisted of comparing the quantitative scores of the subjects on a Trial Problem Solving Exercise. The results were analyzed using the t-test for

Table 13

Percentage of Agreement Between Raters on the Three Dimensions of the T.P.S.E. Forms A and B

	Form A	Form B
Organization and Planning Procedures	88.0	90.8
Issues	80.0	92.0
Information Input	91.9	82.0

correlated measures. Separate scores were obtained in the following areas: information processing, issues, and organization and planning. The information processing dimension actually yielded two separate scores in source and content. The dichotomy in information processing was brought about by the investigators' attempts to reduce the confusion which appeared in trial runs in developing the instrument. It became apparent that the pilot groups were unable to determine what was wanted--the sources or the content of the information needed to solve the problems. In the analysis of the final results, the two scores were combined and analyzed as one. Table 14 shows the results.

As Table 14 shows, there was a slight gain from the pre- to post-test in the scorable items in the first category of information processing. There was a negative shift on the last two categories of issues and organizational procedure. The apparent gain was subjected to the t-test for correlative measures, resulting in a t-value of 1.3 which was not significant at the .05 level. The results revealed that of the three dimensions of the T.P.S.E. measured, only one showed any shift approaching significance on the pre- post measurement.

Table 14

Comparison of Subjects' Responses on the Three Dimensions of the Trial Problem Solving Exercise

Subjects	Information Processing				Issues				Organization			
	Pre-		Post-		Pre-		Post-		Pre-		Post-	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
1		1	2			0	1			3	2	
2	5			5	2			1	3			4
3		1	4			2	1			3	0	
4	6			3	3			1	3			4
5		3	7			2	4			4	3	
6	4			4	3			2	3			2
7		2	3			1	2			4	4	
8	1			3	2			2	2			3
9		2	5			3	1			3	2	
10	3			1	1			1	3			3
11		3	2			2	0			2	3	
12		3	2			1	2			4	3	
13	3			4	2			2	4			4
14	2			2	1			2	1			1
15		2	4			1	2			3	3	
16	3			3	2			1	4			3
17		4	4			1	3			3	3	
18	4			3	3			3	1			2
19		3	5			3	2			1	2	
20	5			2	2			2	6			4
21		2	6			1	0			2	2	
Form Totals	36	26	44	30	21	17	18	17	30	32	27	30
Pre-Post Totals	62		74		38		35		62		57	

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Objectives, Methods and Findings

Despite the recent development of some training instruments for the preparation of administrators of Special Education, a survey of existing materials indicates that none are optimally suited for use in the training of administrators of Special Education in state education agencies. Thus, it was the purpose of this study to develop and evaluate a reality-based simulation model of the role of a Special Education administrator in a state education agency. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To develop a set of reality-based items based on observed situations in state education agencies;
2. To develop a training model utilizing such items within a simulated environment approach;
3. To assess the viability of the training model and to determine its effect on the trainees in the following skill areas:
    a. Information processing;
    b. Sensitivity to issues;
    c. Organizing and planning.

The study was carried out in two stages:

1. The development of the simulation materials;
2. The implementation and evaluation of the simulation materials.

The developmental stage consisted of expanding the ground rules and background materials for the State of Lafayette, which was the original simulated state developed by Sage for the SEATS game (1967), utilizing material collected (via correspondence and/or site visits) from 29 state education agencies, editing, selecting, and pilot testing the reality-based problem items. The implementation of the training model consisted of administering the materials to 23 new professional staff members from 23 different state education agencies, during a two week workshop held on the Syracuse University campus in June 1970. Assessment of the viability of the training model and determination of its effect in the skill areas of information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning were based on three instruments especially prepared for those purposes. An interview schedule was developed to ascertain if the subjects' perspectives of Special Education Administration had changed as a result of attending the workshop and to get their opinions as to the viability of the simulation approach and the entire workshop itself. A written opinionnaire was prepared, to be completed by the subjects at the close of the workshop, to survey the value of the simulation exercise, to compare it to other methods of administrative training, and to obtain recommendations as to the placement of various parts of the total simulation packet and the relative value of various parts. The opinionnaire also attempted to measure the subjects' reactions to the various supplemental activities of the workshop, such as the mock legislative session. The third evaluation instrument, the Trial Problem Solving Exercise, was developed to measure the three growth variables--information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning.

Conclusions

The first two objectives of the study were clearly successful, as demonstrated by the materials produced, which appeared to provide the basis for a training workshop for state education agency Special Education administrators, perceived as very useful by those persons. It was also demonstrated that the simulation exercise could be based on a set of reality items collected from observed situations in state education agencies.

The investigators were concerned with the development of reality-based in-basket items from two dimensions. One dimension had to do with the time period during which the task items were collected. The site visits were all made during one week, and the S.D.R.S. forms were mailed six weeks apart in December and January. This time concentration for collection of materials can cast doubt upon generalizability.

The second concern of the investigators also had to do with the site visits to the state education agencies. Other than the interview schedule which was developed for the purpose, the visits lacked standardization. In some states, the state director of Special Education spent as little as one hour with the field observer, while in other states the state director spent as much as three working days with the field observer.

Therefore, the suggestion that the reality-based items are completely representative of the duties and functions of Special Education administration at the state level should be considered with strong reservations.

However, the findings did demonstrate, partially, the degree of success that the investigators had in meeting the third objective of the study: to assess the viability of the training model and to determine its effect on the trainees in the skill areas of information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning. The majority of the participants indicated that the SEASE was an extremely effective learning technique. In addition, most of the participants indicated that, as a result of their participation in the workshop, they had gained a broader perspective of the job of administering Special Education programs on the state level. They also felt that the experience showed them how to think in terms of alternative strategies for solution seeking on problems. Most of the participants felt that simulation itself was a valuable tool, and that it could be used as an in-service vehicle for many training purposes.

The results also showed the strengths and weaknesses of the SEASE from the vantage point of the participants. Almost half of the participants indicated that the SEASE could be improved by greater use of "oral communication situations." A majority of the participants felt that the simulation approach was a highly valuable and appropriate approach, but that it could be improved by greater use of feedback time. In reviewing other studies that look at simulation as a training vehicle, this appears to be a major criticism. The investigators in this study attempted to provide more feedback time and vehicles for feedback than previously attempted. Even with this adjustment it appears that with the intense involvement that simulation generates, much more time is needed for feedback discussion. Participants who have made decisions want to know if they were correct or incorrect. In reviewing the feedback sessions, it may be that the sessions increased anxiety rather than reducing it because these sessions usually focused on looking at alternative strategies as opposed to giving the right answer.

It appears that no evidence was obtained which would confirm the effectiveness of the simulation exercise on the subjects' skill areas of information processing, sensitivity to issues, and organizing and planning. Quite possibly the instrument developed to measure these skill areas lacked sufficient sensitivity to determine if there were any changes or not. It is also quite possible, however, that there may have been changes in an attitudinal dimension on which no attempt was made, in this study, to measure.

Recommendations

1. A follow-up survey of SEASE should be made over a twelve-month period using the State Department Reporting System, so that task items collected are representative of the entire year.

2. The S.D.R.S. survey form should be modified so that the respondent is asked to report significant problems he has had during the reporting period as opposed to the current method of reporting all events that occur during reporting period. This would reduce the large amount of irrelevant material that was collected in this study.

3. With continual use of these simulation materials, attempts should be made to look at cognitive and affective change as a result of participating in the exercise.

4. An experimental design should be established with control groups so that assessment can be made between the comparable value of the simulation approach to teaching with other methods of presenting materials.

5. Increased means of feedback should be provided throughout the simulation exercise so that participants will have an increased feeling of consequence of their actions.

6. The in-basket items in the SEASE should be modified to deal with the tendency of some role-players to refer a large portion of the task items to subordinates within the simulated environment.

7. Consideration should be given to attempting to provide alternatives for handling the anxiety that participants experience during the early stages of the simulation exercise, which in some cases may become counterproductive.

8. Consideration should be given to modifying the initial "interview with the boss" so that it will be more realistic. Substituting "actors" using role scripts for the video tape presentation would be appropriate.

9. In future applications of the SEASE, a short term workshop should be held using incumbent state directors of Special Education as subjects so that the exercise can be evaluated for continued appropriateness.

10. An experimental design should be established so that assessment can be made to determine whether it is most appropriate and productive to use the SEASE in the beginning, at the end or interspersed throughout the workshop session.

11. Consideration should be given to using the SEASE with local directors of Special Education as they could possibly profit from exposure to the problems and issues of administering Special Education programs at the state level, although prospective or new Special Education administrators in state education agencies will probably continue to be the most appropriate group for utilizing the SEASE workshops.

Concluding Statement

The results of this study suggest that the SEASE is an appropriate training vehicle for newly appointed administrators of Special Education in state education agencies. There is little evidence to indicate that the T.P.S.E. has any validity to measure the skill areas discussed in this study. It should be noted however, that this was the first attempt known to the investigators to objectively evaluate in-basket responses from a crude decision making model.

It is hoped that the SEASE will be utilized in further research studies within the context of administration of Special Education at the state level.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. A. Some considerations in the design and use of dynamic flight simulators. In H. S. Guetzkow (Ed.) *Simulation in social science: Readings*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Baker, F. B. A computer course for the behavioral scientist. *Educational Psychological Measurement*, 1962, 22, 617-621.

Barrett, P. R. *Dynamic executive simulation*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 1965.

Bessent, W. A feedback procedure for simulation of administrative in-basket problems. Paper presented at the AERA symposium on feedback in simulation techniques, New York, February 1967.

Blessing, K. R. A state department-university approach in providing internship experiences for prospective leadership personnel in special education. *Exceptional Children*, 1966, 32, 305-309.

Bolton, D. L. Feedback in a selection of teacher simulation. Paper presented at the AERA symposium on feedback in simulation techniques, New York, February 1967.

Bond, J. H. Using simulation technqies to change attitudes of education majors toward professional course objectives. Final report, project no. 1247, grant no. OE-7-47-0000-239. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1965.

Borko, H. (Ed.) *Computer application in the behavioral sciences*. Englewood cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Briggs, G. E. & Naylor, J. C. Team versus individual training, training task fidelity, and task organization effects of transfer performance by three man teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1965, 49, 387-392.

Broadhead, W. R. A study of the use of simulated materials as a method of instruction in educational administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington Square University, 1969.

Burke, P. J. & Sage, D. D. Proceedings: A special study institute program. Westchester County, N. Y.: The Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Second Supervisory district, 1969.

Cleland, D. I. & King, W. R. Systems analysis and project management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Cogswell, J. F., Egbert, R. L., Marsh, D. G., & Yett, F. A. Construction and use of the school simulation vehicle. Santa Monica, Calif.: System Development Corporation, 1964.

Cohen, K. J., Cyert, R. M., Dill, W. R., Kuehn, A. A., Miller, M. H., Van Wormer, T. A., & Winters, R. R. The Carnegie Tech management game. In H. S. Guetzkow (Ed.). Simulation in social science: Readings. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Cohen, K. J., & Rhenman, E. The role of management games in education and research. Management Science, 1961, 7, 131-166.

Connor, L. E. Preliminaries to a theory of administration for special education. Exceptional Children, 1963, 29, 431-436.

Connor, L. E. Preparation programs for special education administrators. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 161-167.

Cruickshank, D. R. The use of simulation in teacher education. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1969, 20(1), 23-26.

Cruickshank, D. R., & Broadbent, F. W. The simulation and analysis of problems of beginning teachers. Final report, project no. 5-0789. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1968.

Cruickshank, D. R., & Broadbent, F. W. Simulation in preparing school personnel. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1970.

Culbertson, J. A. Simulated situations and instructions: A critique. In J. A. Culbertson (Ed.) Simulation in administrative training. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1960.

Dawson, R. E. Simulation in the social sciences. In H. S. Guetzkow (Ed.) Simulation in social science: Readings. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Dillman, D. H., & Cook, D. L. Simulation in the training of R and D. project managers. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1969.

Eckman, D. P. (Ed.) Systems research and design. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1961.

Erickson, D. A. Essay review: Dimensions of administrative performance that Hemphill missed. School Review, 1964, 72, 490-498.

Feigenbaum, E. A. An experimental course in simulation of cognitive processes. Behavioral Science, 1962, 7, 244-245.

Feigenbaum, E. A., & Feldman, J. (Eds.) Computers and Thought. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Fern, W. H. Aspects of problem perception and problem solving in educational administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1963.

Gagne, R. M. Training devices and simulators: Some research issues. American Psychologist, 1954, 9, 95-107.

Gray, C., & Graham, R. Do games point to managerial success? Training in Business and Management, 1968, 5(6), 36-38.

Greenlaw, P. S., Herron, L. W., & Rawdon, R. H. Business simulation in industrial and university education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Human relations in school administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Hammerton, M. Transfer of training from a simulated to a real control situation. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1963, 66, 450-453.

Hemphill, J. K., Griffiths, D., & Fredericksen, N. Administrative performance and personality. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Henely, C. A national perspective--preparation programs in special education administration. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Consortium of Universities Preparing Administrators of Special Education, Austin, Texas, March 1969.

Hodgson, F. M. Special education--facts and attitudes. Exceptional Children, 1964, 30, 196-201.

Hoggatt, A. C., & Balderston, F. E. Symposium on simulation methods. Cincinnati, Ohio: Southwestern Publishing Co., 1963.

Horvat, J. J. Feedback in the negotiations game. Paper presented at the AERA symposium on feedback in simulation techniques, New York, February 1967.

Howe, C. E. Roles of the local special education director. Paper presented at the meeting of the Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, University of Illinois, April 1960.

Hudson, F. G. The development of simulation materials: Media for training special education administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1968.

Immegart, G. In-Basket techniques in the preparation of school business officials. Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada: Addresses and Proceedings, 1963, 49, 426-432.

Jaffee, C. L. Problems in Supervision: An in-basket training exercise. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1968.

Jones, R. L. Personal communication relative to the development of materials by the Project for Leadership Training in the Area of the Deaf, San Fernando Valley State College, under a grant from the U. S. Office of Education.

Katz, R. L. Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 1955, 33, 33-42.

Kellogg Foundation, The W. K. Toward improved school administration: A decade of professional effort to heighten administrative understanding and skills. Battle Creek, Mich.: The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1964.

Kersh, B. Y. Classroom simulation: A new dimension in teacher education. NDEA Title VII Project no. 886. Monmouth; Training Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1963.

Kothera, R. J. A criterion and set of reality based problems for simulation in special education administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1967.

Kraft, I. Pedagogical futility in fun and games? National Education Association Journal, 1967, 56, 71-72.

Mackie, R. P. Converging circles--education of the handicapped and some federal programs. Exceptional Children, 1965, 31, 250-255.

Martin, E. W., Jr. Breakthrough for the handicapped: Legislative history. Exceptional Children, 1968, 34, 493-503.

Meir, R. L. Exploration in the realm of organizational theory IV: The simulation of social organization. Behavioral Science, 1961, 6, 232-248.

Milazzo, T. C., & Blessing, K. R. The training of directors and supervisors of special education programs. Exceptional Children, 1964, 31, 129-141.

Ohm, R. E. A game model analysis of conflicts of interest situations in administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1968, 4(3), 70-84.

Plattner, J. W., & Herron, L. E. Matrix: A career orientation simulation. Simulation: Its use in employee selection and training. American Management Association Bulletin 20, 1962, 6-21.

President's Panel on Mental Retardation. Report of the task force on coordination. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Ramseyer, J. A., Harris, L. E. Pond, M. Z., & Wakefield, H. Factors affecting educational administration: Guideposts for research and action. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio University Press, 1955.

Rome, S. C. & Rome, B. K. The leviathan technique for large-group analysis. Behavioral Science, 1961, 6, 148-152.

Sage, D. D. The development of simulation materials for research and training in administration of special education. Final report, project no. 6-2466. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1967.

Sage, D. D. Functional emphasis in special education administration. Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 69-70.

Sage, D. D. The micro-workshop as a vehicle for the training of university personnel in the use of simulation material. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 1970 (a).

Sage, D. D. Simulation in behavioral research and training in the field of special education administration. Paper presented at the ninth Symposium of the National Gaming Council, Washington, D. C., April 1970 (b).

Sargent, C. G., & Belisle, E. L. Educational administration: Cases and concepts. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955.

Scott, A. M., Lucas, W. A., & Lucas, T. M. Simulation and national development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Shepard, W. T. A study of educational administration 250, principles and processes of educational administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964.

Stevens, G. D., & O'Neil, L. P. An application of simulation training for special education administrators utilizing modifications of prepared materials. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Consortium of Universities Preparing Administrators of Special Education, Austin, Texas, March 1969.

Twelker, P. A. Classroom simulation and teacher preparation. School Review, 1967, 75, 197-204.

Twelker, P. A. Simulation: What is it? Why is it? Paper presented at Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Conference, San Diego, California, April 1968 (a).

Twelker, P. A. Simulation: Status of the field. Paper presented at the Conference on Simulation for Learning, Boston, Mass., October 1968 (b).

Vlcek, C. W. Assessing the effect and transfer value of a simulator technique. Final report, project no. 7-32-0410-264. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1965.

Weinberger, M. J. The use of simulation in the teaching of school administration. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965, No. 66-6561.

Willenberg, E. P. Organization, administration, and supervision of special education. Review of educational research, 1966, 36, 134-150.

Wyatt, K. W. Current employment and possible future needs for leadership personnel in special education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1967, No. 68-12-226.

Wynn, R. Simulation: Terrible reality in preparation of school administrators. Phi Delta Kappan, 1964, 46, 170-173.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND MATERIALS

Sample pages from

Administrative Guidelines
Annual Status Report
Initial Communications
State Plan, P.L. 85-926

ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES FOR THE EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN THE STATE OF LAFAYETTE

Selected excerpts from the

School Code

and the

Regulations of the Commissioner of Education

Raymond Jamison
Commissioner of Education

State Printing Office, Capital City, Lafayette
1970

This publication, consisting of selected excerpts from the School Code of the State of Lafayette, the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, pertaining to the education services for handicapped children; and administrative guidelines for program approval, has been compiled for the purpose of assisting local district personnel in the establishment of educational programs for handicapped children.

The Constitution of Lafayette charges the General Assembly with the responsibility of providing for a "thorough and efficient system of free schools.." Chapter IV, Section 49-969 of the School Code states:

"All educational facilities for handicapped children shall be under the supervision of and subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education shall prescribe the standards and make the necessary rules and regulations including but not limited to the establishment of classes, training requirements of teachers and other personnel, eligibility and admission of pupils, the curriculum, class size limitations, transportation, and the applications for claims for reimbursement."

The rules and regulations contained in this publication have been prescribed by the Bureau for Handicapped Children to which the authority vested in the Office of the Commissioner of Education under Section 49-930 of the School Code has been delegated. The basic rules and regulations were filed with the Secretary of State and became effective July 1, 1951 with subsequent interpretation of the Code leading to additions in 1956. They were designated for each area of special education in an attempt to provide a framework for quality programs. Special services for handicapped children are established and maintained by local districts in compliance with the mandate of the Constitution of Lafayette to "provide...all children of this state...with good school education."

Section 49-940, amending Chapter IV of the School Code was enacted in 1969, defining "educationally handicapped" children as a category eligible for service, in addition to the previously authorized "physically handicapped", "educationally handicapped", and "trainable mentally handicapped". Regulations for implementing this act have not yet been established, and until they are adopted, School Districts may apply for reimbursement of excess expenditures under provision of Section 49-970, Pilot, Experimental or Research Programs.

The Special Education staff and committee members who worked on this publication deserve recognition for a job well done. School personnel are encouraged to seek consultation from the Bureau for Handicapped Children for special assistance.

Raymond Jamison
Commissioner of Education

John Gilbert
Director
Bureau for Handicapped Children

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I LAWS GOVERNING SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

1.0 Legal authority.. 1

1.1 Responsibility to provide schooling........................... 1

1.2 Assignment of pupils.. 1

1.3 Authority to set up special instructional and child study services... 1

1.4 Standards, inspection and supervision........................... 2

1.5 Definitions.. 2

1.6 Establishment of cooperative programs........................... 3

1.7 Reimbursement... 4

1.8 Parental prerogative... 4

1.9 Program certification.. 4

2.0 Lafayette School for the Blind................................... 4

2.1 Lafayette School for the Deaf.................................... 5

2.2 Personnel certification.. 5

Part II REGULATIONS OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

1.0 Programs for Child Study Services............................... 6

2.0 Programs for Educable Mentally Retarded Children................ 8

3.0 Programs for Speech and Hearing Therapy......................... 11

4.0 Programs for Hard of Hearing Children........................... 13

5.0 Programs for Deaf Children...................................... 15

6.0 Programs for Crippled or Chronically Ill........................ 17

7.0 Programs for Partially Seeing Children.......................... 20

8.0 Programs for Blind Children..................................... 22

9.0 Programs for Home and/or Hospitalized Children.................. 24

10.0 Programs for Trainable Mentally Retarded Children.............. 26

11.0 Lafayette State School for the Deaf.......................... 27

12.0 Lafayette State School for the Blind......................... 28

13.0 Reimbursement of educational services provided for handicapped children.................................. 29

14.0 Transportation... 30

15.0 Personnel certification...................................... 30

Part III ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

State Agencies and Organizations Offering Services for Handicapped Children.. 35

Training Institutions in Lafayette with special education programs..... 36

ESEA Title VI, Guidelines and Procedures............................ 37

Forms and Reports... 42

1.53 "Trainable mentally handicapped children" means those persons between the age of 5 and 21 years, who are so severely retarded that they cannot be classified as educable but are, notwithstanding, potentially capable of self-help, of communicating satisfactorily, of participating in groups, of directing their behavior so as not to be dangerous to themselves or others and of achieving, with training, some degree of personal independence and social and economic usefulness within sheltered environments.

1.54 "Educationally handicapped children" shall mean those persons between the ages of 5 and 21, who are socially or emotionally maladjusted, perceptually impaired, or who have severe learning disabilities to the extent that they cannot attain reasonable profit from ordinary educational procedures.

1.6 Establishment of cooperative programs (School Code, Chapter IV, Section 48-751)

Upon application, the Commissioner of Education shall authorize two or more school districts to join together to provide educational services, such as vocational and occupational education, driver education, pupil accounting, certain pupil personnel services, and special education services for handicapped children. Financial agreements may consist of either of two types:

1. Services may be offered by a single district, charging tuition or other pro-rata fees to participating districts.

2. Programs may be offered on a cooperative basis, with joint assumption of financial obligation.

The type and extent of service shall be described in a written agreement between participating districts. Such agreements do not become final until approved by the State Education Department.

1.61 Cooperative services for handicapped children (School Code, Chapter IV, Section 49-954)

Where cooperative program agreements are proposed, the administrative unit offering the resulting services shall receive state aid on a basis equal to that provided by local public school programs. However, application for units to be approved must originate from one school district with a statement attached that the remaining districts forming the cooperative will be participating. Special education services for handicapped children which can be provided through cooperative programs shall include:

1. Instructional personnel for special classes.
2. Instructional personnel for itinerant programs.
3. Instructional personnel for resource programs.
4. Administrative and supervisory personnel.
5. Supportive services personnel.

Others upon application to the Commissioner of Education, may be approved.

1.7 Reimbursement (School Code, Chapter IV, Section 49-990)

1.71 Tuition For each child enrolled in approved special program for handicapped children in the school district of residence or in a school district other than the school district of residence, the state board may pay to the school district of attendance an amount not exceeding fifty percent of the costs per school year. Such payment shall be in addition to the state per-capita foundation allowance for all children. (School Code, Chapter III, Section 31-212) Detailed cost accounts shall be maintained, subject to audit and reported to the Bureau for Handicapped, on forms and at times prescribed by that office.

The tuition shall include the cost of operating the educational program for handicapped children, including the costs of identification, examination, supervision and other special education services approved by the Commissioner of Education.

1.72 Special Transportation costs may be reimbursed at rates established by the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education for children enrolled in approved programs. For children attending an approved residential or out-of-state program, the actual cost of the transportation for two annual round trips will be reimbursed.

1.8 Parental Prerogative. (School Code, Chapter IV, Section 49-958) In the event parents or guardians do not wish to have a child of school age placed in a special education program, they must provide satisfactory evidence to the local school board or the Commissioner of Education that the child is receiving equal or better educational advantages elsewhere.

1.9 Program Approval. (School Code, Chapter IV, Section 49-970)

1.91 Standard Programs, established as stationary classes, resource rooms, or itinerant teacher program, may be approved only within the established standards specified in the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

1.92 Pilot, Experimental or Research Programs, may be approved upon special request, to provide a new or different approach to educational techniques and/or methodology related to the area of exceptionality or handicap.

14.0 Transportation

Chapter IV, Section 49-990 of the Lafayette School Code, provides for the reimbursement of special transportation of handicapped children attending special programs.

14.1 Eligibility for Special Transportation

14.11 Transportation shall be provided only when there is evidence that the child can not use regular school transportation.

14.12 Transportation shall be for handicapped children only.

14.13 Transportation will only be considered reimbursable when the child is attending a special program approved by the Bureau for Handicapped Children.

14.14 Transportation may be provided by the local district, private carrier or public transportation. If it is provided by private vehicle, the vehicle must comply with the regulations set forth in Lafayette School Bus Law and Resolution (Revised 1968).

14.2 Reimbursement

The Bureau for Handicapped Children may approve for reimbursement the actual cost of transportation up to $2.50 per child per day, for a child attending on a full time basis, an approved program for the handicapped. Upon application to the Bureau for Handicapped Children, allowance for variances may be approved for such activities as preschool programs and programs for children who cannot benefit from a full day's instructional program. The Bureau may approve for reimbursement the actual costs of transportation on a public transit system. The Bureau may approve for reimbursement the actual costs for aides to assist in the transporting of handicapped children.

14.21 Procedure

The chief school administrator must submit to the Bureau for Handicapped Children, Form BHC-6, on or before August 1 of the completed school year.

15.0 Personnel Certification

In accordance with the authority delegated in School Code, Chapt. II, Section 29-101, the Commission has established specific requirements for professional training. These requirements should be considered minimal for basic competency. All teachers are advised to complete additional work as indicated by their teaching responsibilities or by program requirements at the particular college or university. It is important to note that the development of sequential certification programs is the prerogative of the teacher training personnel at the individual institutions. Those desiring certification in one of the areas of specialization should contact the university or college personnel in charge of the development of such programs in that area. This procedure should follow notification of deficiencies after evaluation of complete transcripts by the State Education Department, Bureau of Certification.

15.1 Certification Standards

Certification Standards for teachers of handicapped children have been established in the areas of Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Mentally Retarded, Crippled or Chronically Ill, Speech and Hearing, Blind and Partially Seeing Children.

Those wishing to be certified as teachers of handicapped children must meet the general state requirement of a degree with the program approved by the institution of attendance, in general education and the professional education. Teachers with life certification in an area other than education of the handicapped, or who have had a minimum of three years of successful teaching must satisfy the requirements specified below for regular licensing and must also satisfy the requirement for a bachelor's degree, if they do not hold a life certificate. Under special conditions, and upon the written request of the employing superintendent, a one year special license may be issued to experienced teachers who have not completed the requirements listed here. When the course requirements have been completed, the candidate becomes eligible for a three year license. After satisfactory completion of three years of teaching in the special area, the license may be converted into a life certificate.

15.11 General Professional Education--18 semester credits required, including such courses as:

- Child Psychology
- Group Tests and Measurements
- Practice Teaching in Regular Grades
- Educational Psychology
- Guidance
- Audio-Visual Aids
- History of Education
- Instructional Methods
- Curriculum Development
- Speech Fundamentals
- Recreation
- Methods in Primary Grades
- Personality Adjustment
- Educational Sociology

15.12 General Education of Exceptional Children--6 semester credits required, including such courses as:

- Speech Correction
- Administration and Supervision of Special Education
- Physical Education for Handicapped Children
- Home and Community Planning
- Health and Exceptional Children

(cont'd. on next page)

TRAINING INSTITUTIONS IN LAFAYETTE WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Teachers of Hearing Handicapped Children	University of Lafayette at Capital City
Teachers of Mentally Retarded Children	State College of Lafayette at Lakeport
	State College of Lafayette at Mercer
	State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam
	State College of Lafayette at Metropolis
	Metropolis University at Metropolis
	University of Lafayette at Capital City
Teachers of Emotionally Disturbed Children	State College of Lafayette at Lakeport
	University of Lafayette at Capital City
	State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam
Teachers of Orthopedically Handicapped Children	State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam
Teachers of Speech Handicapped Children	State College of Lafayette at Lakeport
	State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam
	Metropolis University at Metropolis
	University of Lafayette at Capitol City
Teachers of Visually Handicapped Children	State College of Lafayette at Mercer

ESEA Title VI
Guidelines and Procedures

Introduction

Unlike most provisions of federal legislation dealing with the education of handicapped children, Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-750 as amended) allocates funds for the direct service of children in local school districts. Under its provisions, grants can be made from the federal level through state education agencies to support projects concerned with the initiation, expansion, or improvement of the education of handicapped children at the preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels. Funds are distributed to each state on the basis of school census and no state or local matching funds are required.

While legislative appropriations have fallen short of that anticipated from original authorization, there has been sufficient funds available to have small but significant effects upon programming in the State of Lafayette.

Definition

While the definition of handicapped children often leaves some questions as to whom can be provided for, federal regulations in this case correspond sufficiently well to Lafayette School Code so that any children legally identifiable as Handicapped in Lafayette would be eligible to receive benefits under this Title.

The definition of educational program is likewise sufficiently similar between the regulations under Title VI and existing laws and regulations in the State of Lafayette, that existing state program provisions can be utilized as a guide. Nothing in Title VI regulations should be construed as permitting departure from minimum standards provided under Lafayette Code. Rather, Title VI should be embraced as an opportunity to go above and beyond Lafayette Code in terms of providing increasingly enriched opportunities.

Planning

It is expected that local education agencies will plan on a cooperative basis with all other community facilities and with other school districts within their immediate region in order to determine the most pressing needs. The determination of a project for which Title VI support would be requested should proceed from such planning and should be in terms of greatest need.

Application Procedure

Eligible applicant agencies are limited to local public school districts, although it is permissable and in many cases perhaps desirable for a single school district to be acting as the agent for a group of school districts who might wish to propose a project on a multiple district cooperative basis. When a decision has been reached regarding the nature of a project to be proposed, a letter of intent should be submitted to the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped, Lafayette Department of Education, for review and subsequent advice by the Title VI unit of that Bureau. The letter of intent should contain such information as:

1. Name of submitting school district
2. Name of proposal
3. Time limits of the proposed project
4. Project goals
5. Operational plan (what children would be served and how)
6. Personnel involved
7. Expected outcome
8. Total costs, broken down as to local contribution and Title VI request
9. Assurance of support by the local board and administration
10. Signature of chief school administrator

Letters of intent will be reviewed by the Title VI personnel within the Bureau, augmented by an advisory committee with authority to establish priorities both in terms of need and quality of proposed projects. After such a review, the local school district will be advised regarding the apparent merit of the proposal. This would consist of one of three types of suggestions:

1. To proceed with the development of a formal proposal on the basis of the letter of intent.
2. Proceed but with specific suggestions as to qualifications.
3. Submission of proposal for the intended project is not advisable due to gross weaknesses in the idea or incongruity with perceived needs across the state.

If a formal project proposal is to be developed, it is advisable to carry out such development by broad level participation, including such persons as the local school district administrator(s) of special education, a representative of the local school district general administrative staff, local school district pupil services personnel, a representative of the local teaching staff of a relevant area. This committee should be augmented by a member of the consulting staff from the Bureau for Handicapped Children responsible for the area of handicapped involved, who will be available on request as time permits.

Application forms may be obtained from: Consultant, Title VI ESEA
Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capital City, Lafayette

The finished proposals should be submitted in ten copies to the above address.

Submission dates. Regular school year and twelve month projects must be submitted no later than June 30. Applications for Summer projects must be submitted no later than April 1.

Basic outline. Each project application must contain

1. Resume
2. Application for assistance
3. Statement of assurance
4. Breakdown of project budget
5. List of materials and/or equipment to be purchased

FORMS AND REPORTS

In order to administer the state aid program, all school administrators are requested to complete all necessary forms and forward them to the Bureau for Handicapped Children on the dates outlined below. The Bureau has the authority to approve or disapprove the application for program approval on the basis of the Bureau being satisfied that there is a need for such a program and that it will operate in accordance with the School Code and the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

Reporting Schedule

Name of Form		Due Date
BHC-1	Application for PreApproval of Special Education Units	August 15 (or within 15 days of date that program will start)
BHC-2	Application for Approval of Special Education Personnel	October 1
BHC-3	Application for Experimental and/or Research Program	August 1 (or thirty days prior to initiation of program)
BHC-4	Application for Approval of Home Instruction	Prior to Initiation of such service
BHC-5	Application for Approval of Housing of Handicapped Children In Separate Facilities	30 days Prior to Initiation of Service
BHC-6	Application for Reimbursement Of Special Transportation	On or before July 15 of the School Year in which the Service was rendered.
BHC-7	Application for Reimbursement of Special Education Units	On or before July 15 of the School Year in which the Service was rendered.
BHC-15	Exclusion of a Handicapped Child	Within 10 days after Initiation of such action.

BHC-1

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau for Handicapped Children
Capital City, Lafayette

APPLICATION FOR PREAPPROVAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION UNITS

School Year 19___ to 19___

Name of District County

	Units Apprvd Last Year	Children served Last Year	Unit needs for This Year	No. of children Served This Year	Approx. cost Per Unit	
Directors/Coords of Sp Ed.						
Supervisors						
Child Study Services						
Educable M.R.						
Speech & Hearing Therapy						
Hard of Hearing						
Deaf						
Crippled or Chronically Ill						
Partially Seeing						
Blind						
Home and Hospital Service						
Trainable M.R.						
Educationally Handicapped						

Note: If any of these programs are cooperative ventures with other districts, please list the names of cooperating districts on separate sheet, number and type of program, and district responsible for supervision. A copy of cooperative agreement must be attached. This must be signed by all district superintendents.

Superintendent's Signature____

Date____

ANNUAL STATUS REPORT
ON
PROGRAMS FOR
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
IN
LAFAYETTE
1969-70

State Education Department
Raymond Jamison, Commissioner

Bureau for Handicapped Children
John Gilbert, Director

INTRODUCTION

This year's report from the Bureau for Handicapped Children, when compared with last year's shows a tremendous growth in programs serving children in the schools of the state. However, Lafayette still has large numbers of handicapped children needing services. Lafayette is not alone or outstanding in this respect on the national scene.

The breadth of educational services for handicapped children served in Lafayette can best be seen from examining the various tables listed in this report. It should be particularly noted that programming growth has occurred in response to the recently passed legislation for "educationally handicapped children". While this newest category of handicapped children includes, under the law, a fairly wide variety of handicapping conditions, most of the program growth has been with the intention of serving children who are emotionally disturbed. This is quite probably a reflection of the concern of public school personnel for those children who constitute severe behavior problems in the schools and are, therefore, seen as having the most pressing needs. The development of programs to serve children with perceptual and other learning disabilities, also provided under the new law, has been less in evidence.

Federal support has been of considerable assistance to local school districts in Lafayette in providing monies to develop and expand new programs of a variety of types where existing services had thus far been incomplete, in encouraging the development of innovative approaches to serving children, and in providing training opportunities for professional and ancillary personnel who work with these children.

This report is presented with the intent of providing a complete and accurate description of the present status of programming in Lafayette. It should also point out areas in which more must be done if we are to reach our goal as stated in the Constitution of Lafayette to "provide---all children of this state---with a good school education."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
No. of Instructional Units serving Handicapped children in Lafayette	Table I	2
State Summary of Estimated No. of Children needing special education programs.	Table II	10
District Estimate of No. of Children Needing Special Education programs	Table III	11
Listing of Numbers of children needing services in Lafayette.	Table IV	20
Number of Handicapped children receiving services in State schools for the deaf and blind.	Table V	21

School District	Total Units	Crippled & Chronically Ill	Education-ally Handicapped	Blind & Partially Seeing	Deaf & Hard of Hearing	Educable Mentally Retarded	Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech Correction
HUDSON COUNTY								
New Amsterdam	10.0	1.0				5.0	2.0	2.0
Abbott	11.0	1.0			1.0	7.0		2.0
South Abbott	None							
HUNT COUNTY								
Leon	1.0					1.0		
Greenwich	None							
Treasure Island	3.0						2.0	1.0
Aurora	8.0	1.0				6.0		1.0
Spring	3.0					2.0		1.0
Walnut	None							
Reno	None							
Venice	2.0					2.0		
Eagle Bay	3.0	2.0				1.0		
Flint	2.0					2.0		
JACKSON COUNTY								
Metropolis	176.0	19.0	8.0	4.0	11.0	106.0	13.0	14.0
Lyndon	37.0	1.0			1.0	25.0	4.0	6.0
West Hills	1.0					1.0		
Lewiston	7.0	2.0				3.0		2.0
Eden	40.0	1.0	4.0			25.0	4.0	6.0
Schuyler	16.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	4.0	3.0	5.0
Dormit	19.0		3.0			14.0	1.0	1.0
North Side	20.0	5.0	4.0			9.0	1.0	1.0
Riverton	None							
Lowell	21.0	4.0	2.0		1.0	13.0	1.0	
East River	15.0	3.0				12.0		
LACKAWANNA COUNTY								
Peckville	5.0					4.0		1.0
Jessup	5.0	1.0				4.0		
Evnon	5.0					4.0	1.0	
Dunmore	8.0	1.0				4.0	1.0	2.0
Scranton	None							

School District	School Population	Estimated No. Children needing Special Education	No. Children Now in Special Education	Estimated No. Units Needed	No. Units Provided	Estimated Percentage of Need Provided
JACKSON COUNTY						
Metropolis	64,148	6415	3054	400	176	58.0
Lyndon	8,084	808	119	37.5	10	26.0
West Hills	1,171	117	15	55	1	
Lewiston	2,758	276	211	13	7	42.0
Eden	24,200	2420	404	121	40	33.0
Schuyler	13,600	1360	364	60	16	26.8
Dormit	15,001	1501	401	97	19	19.5
North Side	10,777	1077	520	54	20	37.0
Riverton	412	41	0	2	0	0.0
Lowell	19,721	1972	401	91	21	23.0
East River	18,848	1884	314	88	15	17.0
LACKAWANNA COUNTY						
Peckville	3,823	134	135	18	5	27.9
Jessup	3,261	114	68	15	5	32.8
Evnon	940	33	66	4	5	100.0+
German	269	9	0	1	0	0.0
Dunmore	13,128	460	224	61	8	13.0
Scranton	1,443	51	0	1	0	0.0
Harrison	11,735	411	247	55	11	20.0
East Harrison	3,890	136	10	18	1.5	8.1
Dupont	1,331	47	75	6	1	
South Dupont	4,640	162	0	22	0	0.0
LAKE COUNTY						
Lakeport	16,664	1666	57	78	7	8.9
Virgil	1,439	144	30	7	3	29.4
Cooperstown	2,033	203	0	9.5	0	0.0

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Ames

From: Shirley (your secretary) **Date:** August 21, 1970

I would like to welcome you to your new position. It sure will be nice to have a boss again after working for nine different people these past weeks.

Dr. Strang called Friday morning and asked me to leave a note reminding you to be in his office at 10:30 a.m. on Monday.

I have put together some material which should be of some assistance to you in seeing how things have been done in the past around here. In addition, you will notice that there is some correspondence that Dr. Strang has left for you to take action on. I have a feeling he left it because he wanted your opinion.

I will be absent from work on Monday, due to a death in the family, but I will be in on Tuesday.

Good luck on your new position and I look forward to working with you.

A-1

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Dale O. Ames

From: Anna Peters **Date:** August 20, 1970

I want you to know that I am pleased that the Department has hired someone to bring some leadership to this Bureau. Mr. Gilbert did a lot over the years, but his main concern was nobody should rock the boat. I am looking forward to you being able to straighten things out here and help me over come some of the problems I have been having.

I am particularly concerned with all the paper work that we have to do: checking the BHC #1, BHC #2, etc. This gives us little time to do the really important work. There are many more things, too numerous to mention, which I need your help on. But mostly, I hope you can reduce all this busy work we have.

A-3

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Dale O. Ames

From: Harry M. Sheldon

Date: August 20, 1970

I have taken the liberty of forwarding the Department Annual Evaluation Report. These reports are completed annually by each professional immediate supervisor. Mr. Gilbert had completed all of the evaluations enclosed this past year, for all of the current employees, except Mr. Arthur Bills who had just recently joined the staff. All of the employees on the staff of the Bureau for Handicapped Children have permanent status, except Mr. Bills who will be eligible for permanent status on February 1. If you elect to keep him on probation, he must be given permanent status by July 1, 1970 or released from his post.

You will be responsible for evaluating the performance of all the employees in the Bureau for Handicapped Children next spring.

A-4

PERSONNEL ROSTER

Bureau for Handicapped Children

				Years in Education and Experience		
Name	Title	Age	Training	In Dept.	Teaching	Other
Mr. Arthur Bills	Consultant Mentally Handicapped	28	M.S.+30	0	4	2
Miss Marie Carlson	Consultant Speech and Hearing	39	M.S.	5	14	0
Mr. Joseph Haff	Consultant Speech and Hearing	26	M.A. +15	1	4	0
Mr. Philip Martin	Consultant Orthopedically Handicapped	47	M.S.	8	15	0
Miss Anna Peters	Consultant Mentally Handicapped	33	M.S. + 70	7	4	0
Mrs. Elizabeth Ross	Consultant Visually Handicapped	42	M.S.	6	11	0
Mr. Fred Smith	Consultant Emotional Disturbance	28	M.S.	2	3	2
Mr. James Stevens	Consultant Title VIa & P.L. 85 - 926	34	M.S. + 15	4	7	2

-4

Form No. E-D-015-P

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Annual Evaluation Report

Report based on data from 6/69 to 5/70

Name Miss Marie Carlson

Division and/or Bureau Handicapped Children

Date Employed 9/65

Date 6/3/70

Work Performance Evaluation		Superior	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
Quality of Work	The accuracy, presentability and neatness of individaul work				
Quantity of Work	The amount of work produced		X		
Work Habits	The organization and planning of the individaul work; his dependability and judgment		X		
Work Interests	The individual attitude toward and interest in his duties	X			
Relationship With People	The individual tact, courtesy, self-control, loyalty, and discretion	X			
Resourcefulness	The individual self-reliance, adaptability, versatility, initiative and ease of learning		X		
Supervisory Skills	The individual ability to accept responsibility and to guide or lead other employees in the performance of their duties		X		
Attendance	Record of absence and tardiness			X	
Other Factors (Specify)					
General Comments					

If this is a recommendation of a probation employee andthis person is to be terminated - state your reasons.

Supervisor Signature John Gilbert Date 6/4/70

Employee Signature Date 6/4/70

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Dale O. Ames
From: Elizabeth Ross
Date: August 20, 1970

Mr. Gilbert gave me this letter just before he left the Bureau in June. I suppose that he wanted me to answer it, but being that a reply may be construed as Departmental policy, I felt that I should withhold action until such time as you joined the staff and studied the issues included.

You should be aware that the Alumni Association has been quite resistive to the Bureaus efforts these past few years to gear up the school's program to provide for the more multiple involved blind child. The Alumni Association and Teachers Association were particularly successful in blocking our office's attempts to establish a special class for trainable retardates at the school.

I look forward to your guidance and assistance in handling this problem.

A-5

2241 W. Genessee Street
Modesta, Lafayette

June 15, 1970

Mr. John Gilbert
Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

On behalf of the Alumni Association of Lafayette School for the Blind, I would like to thank you for your many years of service to handicapped children in the state of Lafayette, and we wish you well in your new University position.

Since you will be in your position a few more weeks, I would like to raise with you a question that has been bothering me an our association for some time. Although the record of Lafayette School for the Blind graduates attending post high school programs has been adequate, we have all hoped that it would be increasing in the future. In view of all of our hopes for the future graduates of the State School, we are concerned with what appears to be a trend of placing retarded children in this school. Please understand that we are not against those children receiving an education, but there are many facilities to educate the retarded in Lafayette, but only one school for the blind. If your Bureau continues to appoint retarded children to the school, our college bound students will most certainly loose out in the long run. Few people in society help the blind, but many help the retarded. Please help us keep our school for the blind only.

We will appreciate any consideration that you can give.

Sincerely,

Edward Groas
President of Lafayette School for
the Blind Alumni Association

A-5

PART I, SUMMARY COVER SHEET

Date of Application: December 30, 1969

IDENTIFICATION

A.	Name of State Education Agency	Address
	Lafayette Education Department	100 State Office Building Capital City, Lafayette
B.	Name of Department or division in which program is administered.	Address
	Bureau for Handicapped Children	State Office Building Capital City, Lafayette
C.	Name and title of person responsible for the administration of the program.	Address
	John Gilbert, Director Bureau for Handicapped Children	State Office Building Capital City, Lafayette
D.	Name and title of financial officer	Address
	Paul Randall, Assistant Commissioner for Finance	State Office Building Capital City, Lafayette

The State education agency certifies that it has read the manual and familiarized itself with the provisions set forth therein. Therefore, if an award is made pursuant to this application, the State Education agency agrees to abide by all applicable terms and conditions set forth in the Manual for Use by State Education Agencies in Applying for and Administering Programs Authorized by Public Law 85-926, as amended, August 1968.

OFFICIAL AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT
GRANT FOR STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Name: (Please type)

Raymond Jamison

Title:

Commissioner of Education

Signature:

PART III STATE PLAN ABSTRACT
(P.L. 85-926, As Amended)
Academic Year 1970-71

A. Lafayette Education Department - February 20, 1970

B.

Summary of State Plan	Total Cost
1. Direct Administration of State Plan	19,600.00
2. Full-time Summer Traineeships	90,000.00
3. Master's Fellowships	5,300.00
4. Post-Masters Fellowships	20,700.00
5. Special Study Institutes	14,400.00
Grand Total	$150,000.00
Grant-In-Aid	$150,000.00

C. Summer Traineeships - (100 x 150 x 6 = $90,000.00)

Administrators	(5 x 150 x 6 weeks)	4,500.00
Crippled	(2 x 150 x 6 weeks)	1,800.00
Deaf	(6 x 150 x 6 weeks)	5,400.00
Emotionally Disturbed	(7 x 150 x 6 weeks)	6,300.00
Mental Retardation	(43 x 150 x 6 weeks)	38,700.00
Speech and Hearing	(30 x 150 x 6 weeks)	27,000.00
Learning Disabilities	(7 x 150 x 6 weeks)	6,300.00

D.	Master's Fellowships (1 x 5,300)	5,300.00
E.	Post Masters Fellowships (3 x 6,900)	20,700.00
F.	Special Study Institutes	14,400.00

PART IV

Direct Administration of State Plan (P.L. 85-926, as amended)

A. Budget For Direct Administration

1.	Personal Services	
a.	Professional Staff to Administer the Program Mr. James Stevens	16,000.00
b.	Secretarial Staff	2,000.00
c.	Employee Services and Benefits	800.00
d.	Honoraria for Outside Consultants	400.00
2.	Travel	
a.	Administrative travel of State Staff	100.00
b.	Inservice Travel	300.00
	Grand Total	$19,600.00

B. Professional Staff

1. Consultant for (P.L. 85-926) Bureau for Handicapped Children, Lafayette Education Department Professional training.

2. Duties and Responsibilities

   (a) Administers the State Plan for the preparation of Special Education personnel
   (b) To coordinate with the Bureau Director the State Plan write up
   (c) Plans, organizes, develops, with the Bureau Director and professional staff of the Bureau, special study institutes.
   (d) Develops a program of recruitment of personnel for careers in the education of handicapped children.

Lafayette State Education Department
Bureau for Handicapped Children
Record of Field Visits and/or Meetings

NOTE: All consultants should fill out this form as soon as possible after returning from the field. Expense accounts will not be accepted unless accompanied by the field visit form.

CONSULTANT Miss Anna Peters

DATE OF VISIT 6/1/70

PLACE OF VISIT Beaudet Central School - Crater County

PURPOSE OF VISIT Annual Supervisory Visit

INDIVIDUALS VISITED Mr. Halbert Holland, Supt. and
Miss Jane Anners, Special Class Teacher

CONTENT OF VISIT OR MEETING
Visit with Supt., Special Class Teacher, and
Special Class.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITY This school should be visited again in Sept.
to make sure they maintain min. standards.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
The chronological age range in the class must be reduced.
Currently there are 15 children in this class with a C.A. range
of 6 thru 18.
State aid should be withdrawn until such time as the district
provides more instructional units for these children.

Signature Anna Peters
Date 8/6/70

A-6

NATIONAL
SOCIETY
FOR
AUTISTIC
CHILDREN

Dr. John Strang
Assistant Commissioner
Division of Instructional Services
State Education Department
Capital City, Lafayette

Dear Dr. Strang:

I am writing to you in my capacity as President of the Lafayette State Chapter of the National Society for Autistic Children. Our organization is becoming increasingly concerned with the lack of educational programs in Lafayette for autistic children.

There are too many of our children with severe learning disabilities that are receiving little or no schooling. Days, months and years have gone by and our children are not getting those special classes, special help and especially trained teachers. These children need every one of these and none of these will be given to them unless society takes an active interest in the plight of the autistic child.

We want special programs now - not tomorrow! We are all parents of children who have been diagnosed as; autistic and cerebral dysfunction, learning disabilities because of hyperactivity, behavioral problems and short interest span. We can't set up these programs alone. We need the help of the State Education Department. If we do not receive your help, our organization will be forced to become more militant in having our cries and please for help heard throughout the State. Remember there are many of us parents in Lafayette who are concerned about the lack of educational programs for our handicapped children. What kind of a role will the Lafayette Education Department play? I look forward to an early response to your answering this question.

Faithfully yours,

Alexander Fillmore

Alexander Fillmore
1416 Atlantic Avenue
Metropolis, Lafayette

APPENDIX B

STATE DEPARTMENT OBSERVATION FORMS

Sample Forms, Blanks, and
Interview Schedules

State Department Observation Form No. 1

TIME	PLACE	ACTIVITY	COMMENTS

State Department Observation Form No. 1

TIME	PLACE	ACTIVITY	COMMENTS
8:45	Dir. Office	Dir. dictated a letter concerning the awarding of a traineeship to an individual who had previously been turned down. (copy of letter attached)	The Dir. told me that he receives a great deal of pressure concerning these funds. A State Senator intervened in this case.
9:30	Dir. Office	Div. Staff Meeting (copy of agenda attached)	Consultants expressed concern about the amount of paper work they had to do and this is keeping them from their important work
10:20	S. D. Office	Had coffee w/Div. Dir. During our conversation he indicated one of his biggest problems was recruiting prof. staff with the salary scale of his State Department.	
10:40	S. D. Office	S. D. showed me his morning mail - it contained the following problems 1. 2. 3.	

Selecting Personnel for the Unit
(Professional and Classified)

1. What is your role in recruiting and hiring qualified personnel for your unit.

2. What procedures do you use in recruiting professional personnel?

3. What procedures do you use in selecting and hiring of new personnel?

   a. Are other units of your agency involved in the selection process?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Supervision of Unit Personnel

1. How is evaluation of professional personnel handled?

2. How is evaluation of classified personnel handled?

3. What provisions are made for in-service development of your unit staff?

4. How is allocation of work load handled?

5. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

6. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Preparing the Budget

1. What is your role in preparing the budget for your unit?

2. Since budgets are drawn up in terms of estimated needs, what type of planning enters into your forecasting financial requirements of your unit?

    a. Do you use PPBS?

3. What superordinates are involved in approving your budget?

    a. Intra-agency

    b. Inter-agency

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Preparing Publications

1. Generally, State Education Departments concerned with the education of handicapped children, coordinate, edit, and prepare for distribution, a wide variety of publications. What has your role been in producing such publications?

2. Is publication a singular activity of your unit, or are other units or persons from the field involved.

3. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

4. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Maintaining Inter-agency Relationships

1. Given that other agencies, both private and public, are concerned with handicapped children - what effort has your unit made to coordinate services for handicapped children with other agencies?

   a. Are you involved with DVR, Voc. Ed., Mental Hygiene, etc.?

2. Has your unit participated with any other agency in any cooperative and/or joint projects?

3. Do you have any statewide planning or advisory boards?

   a. Is the private sector (ARC, UCP, etc.) represented?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Legislation

1. What is the role of your unit in fostering and drafting legislation for handicapped children in (name of state)?

2. Is your role defined, formal, informal, etc.?

3. Do you work with private agencies in the development of new legislation?

4. Have you or do you expect to appear before the state legislative committee?

    a. Have you prepared statements for this committee?

5. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

6. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Topic 7

Establishing and Maintaining Standards

1. Does your state have standards for such areas as size of classroom, minimum number of equipment, etc.?

   a. If so, what is your role in guaranteeing that the standards are being maintained?

2. Are you involved with standards regarding curriculum?

   a. If so, how is this implemented?

3. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

4. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Distributing State Funds

1. Given that your state (check this prior to visit) has a formula for distributing special aid, what is your unit's role in the process?

2. Do you have criteria for districts to meet before they can receive special aid?

3. How is monitoring or enforcing requirements on funding qualifications handled?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

U.S.O.E. Funds

1. How does your unit administer federal funds available under ESEA?

    a. Title I

    b. Title II

    c. Title III

    d. Title VIa

    e. Voc. Ed. (15%)

2. Do you have any type of advisory committee which recommends priorities, etc.?

3. How does your unit administer P. L. 88-164 funds?

4. How have you been involved in developing and securing approval for your state plan?

5. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

6. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Topic 10

Sponsoring and Directing Research

1. Does your agency, using its own funds (not federal), provide for funding of research and/or demonstration projects?

2. Has your unit carried out U.S.C.E. funded R & D projects?

3. Does your unit have a function administering a census for handicapped children?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Fostering and Improving Local Programs

1. In view of the current laws and regulations pertaining to the education of handicapped children, what is your role in evaluating programs?

   a. Are field visits regularly scheduled to local districts?

   b. If so, how often?

2. By what process do you initiate programming for handicapped children where large numbers of children go unserviced?

   a. How do you arouse the interest of local districts to provide services?

3. What is your unit doing to foster the integrative process for handicapped children into non-academic and academic programs in the public schools?

4. What type of activities has your unit been engaged in as a result of specific requests or complaints from parents of handicapped children concerning the lack of services for their child?

5. What is your role regarding evaluation and recommendation of instructional materials?

   a. Does this involve an established IMC?

6. How are you involved with giving direct service to handicapped individuals, as opposed to working through local school personnel.

7. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

8. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Encouraging In-service Growth of Professional Personnel

1. What has been your unit's role and function in providing in-service growth through extension and campus classes, teacher workshops in local school systems, etc.?

2. Is your unit providing, or fostering, the development of in-service education for personnel other than special class teachers? **Such as:**

   a. regular class teacher

   b. regular school administrators

   c. ancillary personnel

   d. auxillary personnel

   e. others

3. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

4. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Topic 13

Recruiting, Training and Certification of Instructional Personnel

1. What role do you have in recruiting teachers for the field?

2. What role do you have in establishing and monitoring teacher certification standards?

    a. Does this involve your unit, or other units in the agency?

3. What role do you have in teacher education?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Topic 14

Residential Schools

1. Does the agency have authority for the administration of schools(s) for the deaf and blind?

   a. Specifically, what is your unit's involvement in administering these schools?

   b. Is your unit responsible for preparing and/or approving their budget?

   c. Does your unit have a role in the hiring of personnel for this school?

   (Ask same type of above mentioned questions if school is private but state supported)

2. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

3. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrence that would illustrate your function with this activity?

Topic 15

Supervision and/or Administration of Programs for Handicapped Children in the Private Sector

1. Does your State Education Department have responsibility for supervising, administrating, or assessing programs for handicapped children in the private sector?

    a. If so, what is your role?

2. What form does your supervision take?

    a. site visits

    b. chartering

    c. paper inspection only

    d. other

3. Does your state pay for the education of handicapped children in the private sector?

    a. If so, is it in-state, out-of-state, or both?

    b. What disabilities are included?

    c. What other criteria apply?

4. What problems have you had that are directly related to the above mentioned area?

5. Can you give me an example(s) of some occurrences that would illustrate your function with this activity?

APPENDIX C

STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTING SYSTEM

Instructions, Sample Forms,
and Blank

State Department Reporting System No. 1

Date_______________

Place	Type of Activity

INSTRUCTIONS

It is the purpose of the S.D.R.S. to provide a basis for studying the job function of personnel in State Departments of Special Education. The data collected will provide a basis for the development of the task items which will be a major aspect of the simulation training vehicle.

You are being asked to record all of your activities on two days, one during the month of December (the next business day after you receive this), and the other in late January. The activities should be entered on the enclosed forms (S.D.R.S. #1). When you have completed recording your activities for the day, forward the form(s) to us in the enclosed envelope.

Enclosed with this material, you will note a sample form (S.D.R.S. #1). Although the activities mentioned in this sample may or may not be typical to your organization, we have enclosed this sample form to illustrate the method that we would like you to follow in recording your activities.

After recording the day's activities, if you have copies of letters, memos, or publications relating to that day's activities which would provide further illustration, it would be greatly appreciated if you could send them to us. We assume that most offices have copying machines available.

If an individual, or organization's name appears on the correspondence, please feel free to block it out. Please be assured that complete anonymity will be maintained and all material will be destroyed after the task material is developed.

State Department Reporting System No.

Date__________

Place	Type of Activity
Office AM	Phone call from a school Supt re: a child in his district — a slow learner — he felt child should be placed in spec. class, but test scores indicate child not retarded.
AM	drafted form letter to be sent to all training institutions in state announcing criteria for summer traineeships
AM	Met w/ Supt of State School for Deaf - He is concerned re: our proposed budget cuts
AM	Rec'd phone call from State Commissioner asking me to arrange a conference w/ him, State Executive Director of ARC, President of State ARC and myself
Personnel Bur.	Dropped in to remind them of the staff shortage in our office

APPENDIX D

SAMPLES OF WRITTEN REALITY-BASED IN-BASKET ITEMS

EDEN CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
EDEN, LAFAYETTE

January 12, 1971

Dr. Dale O. Ames, Director
Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Dr. Ames:

I would like to respond to you in regard to a letter we received from Mr. Gilbert last Spring and reassure your department that we have not decided to disregard the Commissioner's regulations. Our programs have always been planned and carried out in accordance with the goals of the State Education Department's policies.

The policy regarding special classes, as I read it in the Commissioner's regulations states that "classes shall be located in school buildings with other boys and girls of comparable age. Classes housed in separate buildings will not be approved".

It would appear that perhaps we might have had more dialogue with your office as to the precise meaning of "separate buildings".

The classes provided by the Eden Central School District for all of the educable mentally retarded children of intermediate through high school age are housed in a public building which has all of the characteristics and facilities of the school. We therefore interpret it to be a public school building. There are approximately 250 handicapped pupils of the same age rank in the building (15 EMR classes including children from age 11 through 19 and 4 TMR classes including the ages 8 through 18) as well as approximately 500 high school students who attend this school part time for occupational educational courses. It is true that the program is ungraded so it would be impossible to identify a child as in a regular grade but this seems to be a commendable innovation that has had encouragement from many educational leaders.

In terms of integrations into regular school activities, this apparently means that each pupil should participate in a complete educational program which in addition to regular classroom instruction would include music, art, industrial arts, crafts, homemaking, physical education, library and health services. Our school provides in addition to these programs, day camp, intermural sports, scouting groups for both boys and girls, work experience typewriting and assembly programs.

In this school as in all others, proper grouping of pupils, shared resources, supervision, teacher cooperation and in service training of staff are all more adequately available when we have personnel groups together in one facility. In addition, psychologists, social workers and other consultant personnel are more readily available since they are responsible for this concentrated group of pupils.

The added benefits of having these classes in the school that has occupational education include: girls get their hair done by the cosmotology students; students in child care get experience in the special classes; the house for homemaking was built by the carpentry class; instructional music interests are shared; data processing provides attendance information; food services provides work experience; older students can use occupational education shops; vocational guidance can be more effective.

When the question of quality program is raised, I would like to submit that we have highly supporting evidence. The parents are very well pleased, the pupils seem to be making progress, the teachers see many accomplishments, and recruitment of qualified staff presents no problem. Supporting staff attest to the development of instructional situations that truly meets the individual needs. If success after school is any criteria the total income of 40 pupils graduated from the program or now in cooperative work programs was $100,000 during the past fiscal year.

We have had classes in our center for nearly two years now. As a part of our deliberations before moving into the center we conducted considerable research on such matters. The research summary compiled by one of our teachers at that time indicates that there has been no research which substantiates the desirability of having classes at a regular school or in a separate facility. So presumably there is a need for more experience and more evaluation. We would be pleased to participate in any such research to judge the efficacy of our model.

Special Education has changed from pigeon-holing pupils by labels to child-oriented individualized educational opportunities. Districts are developing cooperatively schools that can afford very specialized programs that may be beyond the capabilities of the individual districts. It is our view that a center concept such as ours expanded to an even broader geographic base could serve as a model to provide much needed prevocational and vocational training for a wide variety of regular as well as handicapped children.

To return to your suggestion that we have disregarded policy, as you can see we have regarded the intent of the policy as forthrightly and as conscientiously as possible. We have translated the policy into a program that is serving boys and girls very well. We have come to the conclusion that after considering all alternatives available our center is truly serving the best interest of these boys and girls.

I am sure that with understanding of our total concept you will wish to join us in supporting the effort. We will be glad to discuss the program further with you at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

James O'Donnell

James O'Donnell
Assistant Superintendent

JO'D:wk

-56.

May 27, 1970

Mr. James O'Donnell, Assistant Superintendent
Eden Central School District
Eden, Lafayette

Dear Mr. O'Donnell:

I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity to meet with you when I was visiting in your area last week. I feel however that I had an excellent opportunity to review most of the aspects of the Special Education program in your district, as a result of the complete tour provided by your Director of Special Education Robert Jones.

It was my feeling that your program has many commendable aspects.

However I am compelled to express to you the concern of our department regarding the apparent decision in the Eden Central School District to disregard the Commissioner's regulations regarding the housing of special programs for handicapped children. I am referring of course to the combined Special Education - Occupational Education Center which has been established on the Valley View site.

In speaking with Mr. Jones I am sure that the administrative staff and Board of the Eden Central School District has been aware of the policy of the state of Lafayette as manifested in Commissioner's regulations emphasizing the desirability of maximizing the intergration of handicapped children into the main stream of education as far as possible.

It would seem to be quite obvious that the housing of your special classes in the Valley View Center is not in keeping with this policy of intergration.

We understand that this particular housing arrangement has only been in effect during the past year or so. I would like to point out that the initial approval of units for the support of your Special Education program from the state level was predicated on the assumption that your district would follow all aspects of the Commissioner's regulations which were in effect before and now. I feel that this is an issue which must be dealt with as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

John Gilbert
Director, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Consultant, Mentally Handicapped

.56

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

Bureau of Education
for the Handicapped

January 20, 1971

Honorable Raymond Jamison
Commissioner of Education
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Commissioner Jamison:

Public Law 85-926, as amended, authorizes grants to State education agencies to prepare teachers and other specialists in the education of handicapped children. The allocation to each State is determined on the basis of its relative population.

As you may know, States wishing to participate in this grant program must submit a State plan indicating the manner in which the allocated funds will be utilized. Specifically, the funds may be used for special study institutes, summer traineeships, graduate fellowships, junior year traineeships and senior year traineeships. A State may use up to 20% of its total grant for administrative costs, such as salaries of both professional and clerical personnel employed to administer the State Plan, employee services and benefits, and travel.

To date, Congress has not completed action on the Fiscal 1971 appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are, therefore, unable to determine the full allotment for each State at this time. We are authorized, under provisions of a Continuing Resolution, to allocate funds equal to the Fiscal 1970 allocation for each State. We, therefore, are asking that you prepare and submit your Fiscal 1971 State Plan for Preparation of Professional Personnel in the Education of Handicapped Children based on an amount equal to your Fiscal 1970 allocation of $150,000. If additional funds become available, we will notify your of the increase and request and amendment to the plan to reflect use of the additional funds.

State Plans for Summer 1970 and academic year 1971-72 must be submitted to the Office of Education on or before February 27, 1971. If your State does not wish to participate in the program for the coming award year, or if you cannot utilize the full amount of your allocation, we would appreciate a letter to this effect by the February 27, 1971 deadline. Requests for additional information or material should be directed to Dr. Felix Furtwingler, Coordinator, Unit on State Plans, Division of Training Programs, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education - HEW, ROB #3, 7th & D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C., 20202.

We look forward to your participation in this program to help prepare the personnel needed to serve handicapped children.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. John McCleod
Director
Division of Training Programs

cc: State Director of Special Education

BHC-5

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau for Handicapped Children
Capital City, Lafayette

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF HOUSING OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN IN SEPARATE FACILITIES

School District Cooperstown County Lake

Program to be placed in separate facility Elementary Trainable

No. of children to be served in separate facility (11) eleven

No. of Instructional units to be served in separate facility (1) one

Reason(s) that program(s) can not be housed in regular school building:

Due to a severe space shortage, we must move this elementary trainable class into the local Baptist church basement. We anticipate that this program will start 9/1/71/

Superintendent's Signature

Jerry Carney

Jerry Carney, Superintendent

Date January 14, 1971

-61

January 15, 1971

Dr. Dale O. Ames
Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Dr. Ames:

I am writing to you in the capacity of Chairman of Better Education Committee of the Metropolis N.A.A.C.P. Our organization is concerned with the lack of federal funds coming into Metropolis special education program. We are interested in obtaining a list of all projects funded under Title I and Title VIa of E.S.E.A. If our share of the available funds is less than what we should be getting, I would appreciate your explanation as to why this is.

Our organization looks forward to an early reply.

Sincerely,

James L. Lewis

James L. Lewis, Chairman
Better Education Committee
213 Hayes Avenue
Metropolis, Lafayette

JLL:lf

D-62

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Dale O. Ames

From: James Stevens

Date: January 16, 1971

For the past 8 years the Bureau for Handicapped has awarded several fellowships for masters degree and post masters study, under the provisions of P.L. 85-926. In checking informally around the state, I find most of the recipients of these fellowships have gone on to greener pastures. I think that we should consider not awarding fellowship awards this next fiscal year, and put that money into traineeships and special study institutes.

It is my impression that the universities and colleges get about all the fellowship monies they need, so why should we impose more money and students on them. The training institutions have never been particularly responsive to our problems in the field, so I would think that we could get a better return out of our money through traineeships and institutes than by training people to become college personnel.

D-63

JEFFERSON STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
New Salem, Jefferson

To: State Directors of Special Education

From: Raphael F. Kirk, Director

Date: January 12, 1971

As I am sure you are aware, there has been an increasing thrust from the American Speech and Hearing Association to encourage the phasing out of four-year training programs leading to provisional certification for speech correctionests, in favor of restricting such training to those institutions which offer five year programs.

While any professional person can understand the principle behind the position taken by ASHA, in terms of the desirability of professional upgrading, it must also be clear that the policy making portion of that membership may not be in as favorable position for assessing the needs of the field (within the public schools) as we who are directly involved in such service. It is we who must worry about recruiting personnel to fill the vacancies in positions allocated to serve the handicapped, not the professors in the University programs who tend to influence positions such as that taken by ASHA.

In view of the lack of evidence regarding any real difference in functioning - only an assumption that five years are better than four - it would seem to be premature to cut off all possibilities of getting a professional person into the field to begin practice when they are needed.

We in the State of Jefferson have retained our past certification requirements, permitting provisional certification after four years, with the fifth year to be completed for permanent certification within a five year period. We have thus supported the concept of multiple avenues to terminal training. The question I would ask, and the purpose of this memorandum, is "Are we out of date?"

Would you be willing to communicate something of your situation? Are there training institutions in your state who have adopted the ASHA position completely? Has there been any resistance to this position from training institutions? Has this become an issue between the institutions, the field, the state education department in your state? What is your personal view?

May I suggest that by sharing our several viewpoints on this issue at this time, we might all gain a better "fix" on the status of things nation-wide and therefore determine whether there is still time to fight for flexibility. I will be pleased to compile the information you send to me and report back at our next meeting of N.A.S.D.S.E.

Please understand - I am not against five years of training. I am merely for sufficient flexibility to allow training and certification standards to accommodate regional needs and the avoidance of a monolithic model for personnel preparation. There is far too much uncertainty about the "routes to competence" for the profession to become locked in to ASHA or any other single viewpoint.

Lafayette State Education Department
Bureau for Handicapped Children
Record of Field Visits and/or Meetings

NOTE: All consultants should fill out this form as soon as possible after returning from the field. Expense accounts will not be accepted unless accompanied by the field visit form.

CONSULTANT Anna Peters

DATE OF VISIT December 17

PLACE OF VISIT Central School District

PURPOSE OF VISIT Annual Inspection of Special Education Units

INDIVIDUALS VISITED Mr. Brad Fillern, (cord. Pupil Services), and the special class teachers: Mrs. Janet Baldwin, Mrs. Freida Grey, Mr. Harvey Shepard, Mr. Edward Balder, Miss Joan Dinnersten

CONTENT OF VISIT OR MEETING This school district is not integrating any of its special Educable Mentally Retarded classes into any of the regular school activities. Although the classes are located in a regular school building, the children receive no physical activity.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITY Follow up visit scheduled for February

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS I recommend that state aid be withdrawn unless the special children are integrated into regular class physical education activities.

Signature Anna Peters
1/5/71

D-67

LA BIC JACKSON COUNTY CHAPTER
Lafayette Assn. for Brain Injured Children
Eden, Lafayette

January 17, 1971

Dr. Dale O. Ames
Director, Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Dr. Ames:

I was happy to learn of your appointment replacing John Gilbert in the most significant role in the state of Lafayette for the service of our children. I would also like to advise you of some of the reactions which our membership had to a speech given by Mr. Gilbert shortly before his retirement last Spring.

In Mr. Gilbert's talk he placed considerable emphasis on the need to assimilate the handicapped into our regular schools. While we agree with this in principle, we find that the very act of establishing good services for our children frequently seems to accentuate the deviation and segregation. Unfortunately as soon as a child goes into a Special Education program he is sure not to be assimilated into his own school and is more likely to be placed in an isolated class in a church or some other abandoned school building.

In the case of my own child, who is being served by a newly established cooperative program among some of the school districts in the southern suburbs of Metropolis, I am personally concerned. From the standpoint of emotional stability and building self worth in the handicapped there doesn't appear to be much positive value in shipping my youngster from our neighborhood school in Arleigh Heights in the West Hill School District, 15 miles and more than an hour on the bus down to the Eden School District where the special program is provided in what was an abandoned school. She would gain much more from being in her own school where friends and neighbors go rather than being shipped off elsewhere.

We have heard and have generally subscribed to the idea that all of the children benefit by having the handicapped in the same school, but this would have a positive value only when the handicapped are in their own school district. The stigma of getting transported off to the unknown, which is what seems to be happening where the new cooperative programs are being developed would appear to be at cross purposes with the most pervasive handicaps with which the handicapped have to deal -- self image. Therefore if the handicapped are to be in such segregated programs it behooves us to at least make it a worthwhile educational situation, that is, proper facilities, good administration and a dependable, permanent home.

D-68

We are of the feeling that the use of abandoned school buildings for special classes for our children is certainly a negative factor in terms of enhancing the self image of the children, and we are further concerned that with the investment so small in physical facilities, they are likely to not be very permanent.

In addition those of us on the Board of our Association have the distinct impression that the programs being operated for our particular needs thus far are certainly of marginal educational value. While we realize that it will take more time to develop highly sophisticated programs we are concerned that the very concept which the cooperative program entails is one in which the self image of the handicapped is reinforced, having a broad impact on their current and future functioning in our society. Mr. Gilbert referred to this as part of the "self fulfilling prophecy".

So far my contact with the Board and Administration at Eden School District has left me considerably less than optomistic regarding change or improvement. I would appreciate knowing where you stand.

Sincerely,

Robert Richards

Robert Richards
3 Heather Drive
West Hill, Lafayette

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Staff, Bureau for Handicapped Children

From: John O. Strang, Assistant Commissioner,
Division of Instructional Services

Date: January 19, 1971

I would like all staff of the Bureau for Handicapped Children to be advised of a pilot project in which our State Agency has been invited to participate under the auspices of the Division of Training Programs, Bureau for Education of the Handicapped, Office of Education.

As you know, under the provisions of a number of federal laws, funds are distributed downward and outward from Washington through a variety of channels for the express purpose of improving education for the handicapped. Funds emanate under three general program areas: (1) personnel training, (2) research, and (3) direct services to the field. In each of these areas, decisions regarding distribution may involve persons at each level of government; federal, state and local.

In the area of personnel training, funds have been distributed primarily through two channels: (1) grants to college and University training programs and, (2) grants to State Education agencies for their use in purchasing or conducting various types of training for personnel.

It has been recognized that optimum usage of federal funds for education of the handicapped would be enhanced if better coordination existed among the local school districts, the State Education agencies, and the Institutions of Higher Education. This is especially true in the case of personnel training.

As a result of conversations between myself and the Director of Training Programs, BEH/OE, an ad hoc committee has been appointed to explore ways by which cooperative planning could be carried out for the use of funds available under P.L. 85-926, as amended.

The committee consists of twelve members -- four representatives from training institutions, who are all professors of special education at schools within the state; four representatives of local school systems, who are all administrators of special education programs; and four members of the Bureau for Handicapped Children, including Dale O. Ames, who is to act as chairman. It is understood

D-74

that not all members of the committee will always be available for every meeting, and the committee has been charged with the task of selecting a smaller Executive Committee of three members to serve as the steering force.

The extent of this committee's authority is as yet undetermined, and governance questions are recognized as one of the issues that will have to be initially dealt with. It has been suggested that if the committee chose to do so, it could propose a plan whereby all training funds coming into the state would be subject to the committee's jurisdiction. BEH would be pleased to have a model for such a method of allocation. Lafayette has the opportunity to develop the prototype.

The Committee will consist of the following members:

Dale O. Ames, Director, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Mr. James Stevens, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Miss Anna Peters, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Mr. Fred Smith, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Henry Morris, Chairman, Department of Special Education State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam
Dr. Lee Leonardo, Professor of Speech Pathology, Metropolis University
Dr. Murray Goldstein, Associate Professor of Special Education University of Lafayette
Dr. John Wycoff, Associate Professor of Special Education, State College of Lafayette at Mercer
Pat Offerman, Assistant Director of Special Education in Metropolis
Dr. Val Giambrone, Director of Special Education, Mercer School District
Harry J. Mallory, Director of Special Services and Projects, Ravena-Springville School District
Dr. Richard Appleton, Director of Special Education, Lyndon Central Schools

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE PHONE CALL ITEM

S.E.A.S.E.

Phone Call Situation C-2

Instructions to Role Player

You are Charles K. Fishell, a social worker in the Peckville Central Schools, in Lackawanna County. Peckville's special education program consists of four classes for educable mentally retarded children and one speech therapist. You are calling Dr. Ames concerning a 15 year old boy who has a mild case of cerebral palsy. You have just finished talking with Mr. Philip Martin, Consultant for Orthopedically Handicapped Children, and you did not get any satisfaction from him, so you feel you should go right to the boss. You received a courteous response from Mr. Martin and you will be "quite" courteous talking with Dr. Ames.

Script

"Hello! This is Chuck Fishell, social worker for Peckville Central Schools. I am calling you about David Boyer, a child who has been in our district for three years. Although he suffers from cerebral palsy--a slight case--we have attempted to provide for his needs in regular classes. He is now in the ninth grade. He has made very little progress in the regular grades and each year he falls farther and farther behind his chronological age peers. He is at the stage where there is no program in the school that meets his needs. Just recently we have tried him one hour a day in Mrs. Stockton's senior high program. The individual help that he has received here has kept up his interest in school to where he no longer wants to quit. We would like to know if we can increase his time in the class next year to about three hours a day. I talked about this yesterday with Mr. Martin but he said his I.Q. was too high for an EMR class. We have talked it over here and our professional judgment is that the part time placement would be in the best interests of the child. Can we get your permission to place him in special class?"

Other points to mention if the opportunity arises

1. "His latest I.Q. is 89."

2. "You know your special class teachers are always asking to have their children integrated into a regular class activity. Why can't the reverse be true?"

3. "Thank you. We will include his name on the B.H.C.-1 Form that we send in the Spring."

4. "I don't know much about cerebral palsy, but from what I can see he gets around O.K., and doesn't shake too much."

S.E.A.S.E.
Phone Call Situation D-2
Feedback Response to C-35

Instructions to Role Player

Before using the alternative scripts attached, the Role Player should review the participant's response to C-35. The participant (Dale) will probably make one of three responses to this item.

1. The participant will comply to some extent with the request made.
2. The participant will indicate that he is unable to comply with the request.
3. The participant will not have made a written reply.
    a. he may have indicated that he would phone.
    b. he may have referred this action to a subordinate in the Bureau for Handicapped Children.

Item C-35 is attached.

CP
CARL COUNTY CHAPTER
UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY
Association of Lafayette
Holland, Lafayette

November 10, 1970

Dr. Dale O. Ames
Bureau for Handicapped Children
State Education Department
Capitol City, Lafayette

Dear Dr. Ames:

We would like to advise you that our Association is going to investigate the local school districts in this county. The United Cerebral Palsy Association in Carl County has been concerned for some time about the lack of educational opportunities for multiple handicapped children in this county. Our concern is not only those children for who there are no services available, but that great numbers of children must be transported daily to Lackawana County.

The Association is going to start this investigation next month, with or without the help of the State Education Department. If you would like to join us in this activity, please contact us immediately.

Sincerely,

Mr. William Frank
President, Carl County U.C.P.

WF:pt

C-35

Phone Call Situation D-2
Feedback Response to C-35

Instructions to Role Player for Dale O. Ames, Response No. 1

You are Frank Brabent, Superintendent of Mystic Central Schools. Mystic's special education program consists of four classes for educable mentally retarded, one class for trainable mentally retarded, and one speech teacher. The total K-12 school population of the district is 6,796. You are calling Dr. Ames because you have just received a phone call from Mr. William Frank, President of the Carl County U.C.P., and you are sure mad. According to your conversation with Mr. Frank, he indicated Dr. Ames' willingness to go along with an "inspection" or "investigation" of Mystic's program for handicapped children.

Script

"Hello"--Dr. Ames. This is Dr. Brabent, Superintendent of Mystic Central Schools. I just received a phone call from Mr. William Frank, the President of the Carl County United Cerebral Palsy Association. He tells me that you (wrote)(called) him and indicated that the State Education Department was going to cooperate with their organization and conduct an "investigation" of our district's services for handicapped kids. Now I've got enough trouble around here without you people in the Capitol adding to it. Just what the hell are you trying to do to me?"

Other points to mention if needed.

1. (If Ames admits that the State is cooperating) "Do you mean to tell me that the State Education Department is encouraging private organizations to investigate local districts? No pause. Is the Commissioner aware of this?"

2. (If Ames backs off) "O.K. but make sure that you write this guy Frank and tell him this investigation thing is off, and send me a copy of this letter."

3. (If Ames denies responsibility) "I don't care how he interpreted your letter, I have a copy here, and you did say -----------."

Phone Call Situation D-2
Feedback Response to C-35

Instructions to Role Player for Dale O. Ames, Response No. 2 or 3

You are Mr. William Frank, President of the Carl Couney United Cerebral Palsy. As you recall, on November 10, 1970 (C-35) you wrote to Dr. Dale O. Ames asking for his help to investigate the public school programs for multiple handicapped children in Carl County.

The following scripts are in response to (No. 2) his somewhat negative response or (No. 3) no response at all.

Script

"Hello" Dr. Ames. This is Mr. Frank, President of Carl County U.C.P. You may recall that I wrote you back in November about the lack of programs for multiple handicapped children in Carl County. (No. 2) I have your response in front of me, and I am somewhat disappointed with what you have to say. (No. 3) Since I haven't heard from you, I'm quite disappointed. If we are going to get these school districts going on providing services for these kids, we need your help."

Other points to mention if needed.

1. "Do you mean to tell me that the State Education Department is not going to help us provide for these multiple handicapped children?"

2. "O.K., but would you send a letter to the school districts in Carl County and tell them that we will be going ahead with this investigation. I have had some trouble already with Dr. Frank Brabent."

APPENDIX F

SAMPLES OF ROLE-PLAY ASSIGNMENTS

Group Problem Solving Item

S.E.A.S.E.
Role Assignment
Bureau C

You are Miss Anna Peters, a Consultant in Mental Retardation, and have been employed for the last seven years in the Bureau for Handicapped Children, and before that you taught a special class for educable mentally retarded children for four years.

You have had some difficulty in getting along with some of the people in the field, because you firmly believe the regulations of the school code shall be firmly enforced, and you have stuck to your guns when you observed variances in programs.

Some of your biases are:

1. You have some serious doubts about the new category of children who are "educationally handicapped," in that you view it as a "dumping ground" for children that regular educators can't handle.

2. You tend to view the training institutions in Lafayette as doing an adequate job in turning out teachers of the retarded, but you have doubts if they could do an adequate job training teachers of "educationally handicapped" children, since nobody really knows who these kids are or what they are like.

3. You view many of the special education people in the Universities and Colleges as quite mercenary. They claim to be concerned with "handicapped children," but when you ask them to do something, they want to know how much you can pay them.

S.E.A.S.E.
Role Assignment
Field A

You are Pat Offerman, Assistant Director of Special Education in Metropolis, where you have specific responsibility for supervising the classes for the retarded. Your district provides 106 classes for the educable mentally retarded, and 13 classes for the trainable mentally retarded.

You have been with Metropolis City schools for many years, and have moved up through the system to a very prestigious position. Your boss, Harold Cartwright, Special Service Director, is very efficient, and you enjoy working in an organization where there is little over-lapping responsibility. You have established a fine special class program for retarded children, and you view talk about resource rooms for educable retarded as a disturbing force on the status quo.

Some of your biases and interests are:

1. You believe that the views expressed by people like Lloyd Dunn are off base, in that they don't consider the real problems facing special educators who have to work every day with these kids.
2. You are particularly sensitive to the problems of the big city today, in that special education has come under fire recently for providing another form of segregation for members of minority groups. You believe that if a child has an I.Q. of 70, no matter what his color is, he belongs in special class. Your belief in this is strengthened, because your boss currently shares this with you. If his values, or those of the system changed, so would yours.
3. You view classes for "educationally handicapped" as a dumping ground for all kinds of "wild kids" and you resist any effort to have classes for the retarded get mixed up with these classes.
4. You think the teacher training institutions have been doing a good job training special class teachers. You don't know what you would do if the universities and colleges in the future started training diagnostic prescriptive teachers, and other kinds of personnel, as you only have classes for the retarded, and what you need is just good teachers.

S.E.A.S.E.
Role Assignment
Training Institution Representative (c)

You are Dr. Murray (Mary) Goldstein, Associate Professor of Special Education at University of Lafayette. You have gained considerable notoriety in your field (Education of the Emotionally Disturbed) by your outspoken criticism of traditional and current practices of using special classes as containment devices for children who create problems for middle-class teachers. It is your contention that a large portion of the children inhabiting classes for emotionally disturbed and for EMR are improperly placed and unfairly stigmatized. You are therefore becoming more invested in the pressing issue of urban education and less devoted to the training of teachers to specifically man special classes. You would like to see categories abolished, both as the basis for training and certification of teachers and also as the basis for distribution of training and service funding.

APPENDIX G

SAMPLES OF SPECIAL ACTIVITY ASSIGNMENTS

Group Problem Solving

S.E.A.S.E.

Task: "Standards Committee" for recommending
regulations for "Educational Handicapped."
(B-11, B-12, B-22)

Instructors Role

This task should be introduced during the B-packet feedback session. An attempt should be made to hold off discussing the B-11 item until the feedback session is just about completed. Items which lead into this exercise are:

1. Item B-12 is a request by a local district for guidance in establishing programs for children with learning disabilities.
2. Item B-22 is a request by the Lafayette Association of Special Education Administrators to speak at their next meeting on the topic of "educationally handicapped" children. Dale should have responded to this item, and may have even outlined what he was going to say to this group.
3. Item B-11 is a memo from John Strang directing Dale to outline the procedures for establishing a "Standards Committee" for recommending regulations for the new category of "educationally handicapped."

The last item (B-11) should lead right into the introduction of the task.

Instructions

"Dale, the Commissioner, upon the recommendation of Dr. Strang, has established a "standards committee" for the purpose of developing a proposed set of regulations for the category of "educationally handicapped." You will find that Dr. Jamison has incorporated many of your suggestions and recommendations in the establishment of this committee. The members of your standards committee are:

Dale O. Ames, Director, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Mr. James Stevens, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children
Miss Anna Peters, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children

Mr. Fred Smith, Consultant, Bureau for Handicapped Children

Henry Morris, Chairman, Department of Special Education State College of Lafayette at New Amsterdam

Dr. Lee Leonardo, Professor Speech Pathology, Metropolis University

Dr. Murray Goldstein, Associate Professor of Special Education, University of Lafayette

Dr. John Wycoff, Associate Professor of Special Education, State College of Lafayette at Mercer

Pat Offerman, Assistant Director of Special Education in Metropolis

Dr. Val Giambrone, Director of Special Education, Mercer School District

Harry J. Mallory, Director of Special Services and Projects, Ravena-Springville School District

Dr. Richard Appleton, Director of Special Education, Lyndon Central Schools

It is now time for the first meeting of the "standards committee." Group members are now being assigned their roles for this activity. In addition to the committee members, two or three persons in each group will be assigned roles as process observers. Dale Ames will assume chairmanship of the first meeting and will endeavor to lead the committee to carry out it's charge. If your particular group does develop a document, we will reproduce it for you, and have it available for the workshop in a few days. You are encouraged to spend as much time as you wish. It may be interesting to compare results of the two "standards committee's" work.

S.E.A.S.E.

Task: "Development of new state plan for P.L. 91-230, Part D" (D-69, C-37, C-44, D-60, D-63)

Instructors Role

This task should be introduced during the latter part of D Packet feedback session. Dale should be asked just what response he did make to item D-60. Items which lead into this task are:

1. Item C-37, a complaint from a local superintendent complaining about time lost by staff members attending special study institutes.
2. Item C-44, a memo from Stevens pointing out to Dale that he should start planning the special study institute for administrators of special education.
3. Item D-63, a memo from Stevens indicating poor pay off for state on full time fellowship awards.
4. Item D-69, a memo from the Bureau of Certification, Director A. Stickler requests that Dale work with Stickler in setting up an Ad-Hoc Committee to look at certification requirements for teachers of "educationally handicapped" children.
5. Item D-60, a request from the Division of Training Programs/ BEH/USOE to submit the annual state plan for funding under the provisions of P.L. 91-230, Part D.

The completion of this task will be up to the participant himself. However, a departure from past assignment methods will be made. In all other activities, the participant was asked to do this himself or in a group. For the purpose of this activity, participants can bring about closure on this by any method they choose, either work at it alone or within a group.

Instructions

"Dale, just what have you done on Item D-60? (Pause.) Good! Now for the moment assume that you have decided to rough out the Lafayette State Plan. You now have an idea of some of the training needs in Lafayette, so your job should not be a difficult one. One other thing, Dale, you can do this by yourself, or work with others in the workshop. That is up to you. However, you should be willing to defend the final product, if it is critiqued by your peers at this workshop. I would recommend that if you do work with a group, that it does not have more than 6 or 7 members."

APPENDIX H

SAMPLE RESPONSE FORMS

REACTION FORM

S.E.A.S.E.

Code No.____________

Item No.	Activity (Doing What)	Recipient of interaction (with whom)	Rationale for action taken

Raymond Jamison
Commissioner of Education

STATE OF LAFAYETTE
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
BUREAU FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
Capitol City, Lafayette

LAFAYETTE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To:

From: Date:

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SEASE Institute

S.E.A.S.E. Institute

June 15-26

Instructors: Dan Sage and Ed Sontag

Donald B. Brunner	Route 2, Box 755 C, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Philip Burke	B-31, Apt. 5, New Slocum Hgts., Syracuse, New York
Gary Carman	3430 Niagara Falls Blvd., North Tonawanda, New York
John Comba	Dir. of Spec. Educ., Idaho State Dept. of Educ., Boise, Idaho
John L. Cross	RFD #1, Nooseneck Hill Rd., Coventry, Rhode Island 02816
Lawrence P. Crouse	1963 Longview Drive, St. Paul, Minnesota 55112
Mrs. Ardella M. Curtis	6613 Park Ave., Richmond, Virginia 13226
Niles C. Deggy	4221 N. Whittier Place, Indianapolis, Indiana 46226
T. J. Feeler	2712 Wesley St., Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
William Filliatreau	501 Newcastle Rd., Syracuse, New York
Miss Virginia J. Ford	948 Bellevue Pl., Apt. 218, Jackson, Mississippi 39202
Joseph Paul Gaughan	62 North 81st St., Lincoln, Nebraska 68505
Miss Elaine E. Gilvear	3641 Brookridge Terrace Apts., Apt. 301 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109
Thomas J. Hicks	11763 Southridge Dr., Little Rock, Arkansas 72205
Al Hoffmann	RR 1, Urbana, Illinois 61801
Annette S. Hyde	213 Main St., Hazelwood, North Carolina 28738
Arthur Jillette, Jr.	13 Highland St., Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Thomas M. LaGrasta	305 Hayward St., Bridgewater, Mass. 02324
Fred Mayfield	790 Dixon Rd., Apt. C-5, Jonesboro, Georgia 30236
David C. Miles	3072 Zion, Aurora, Colorado 80010
John R. Millard	128 Paul Rd., Morrisville, Pa. 19067
Mrs. Wanda N. Radcliffe	612-1 Walnut St., Glenville, West Virginia 26351
Miss Joyce M. Runyon	2060 Continental Ave., Apt. 153, Tallahassee, Florida 32304
Thomas J. Scharf	5510 South Hill Dr., Madison, Wisconsin 53705
Donald K. Trumbull	715 S. E. 143rd, Portland, Oregon 97233

APPENDIX J

INSTITUTE APPLICATION FORM

Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation
805 South Crouse Avenue
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL STUDY INSTITUTE
June 15-26, 1970

Please Print or Type

Name (Dr., Miss, Mrs., Mr.) ____________________

Home Address ____________________

____

Social Security No. ____________________ zip __________

Present Position ____________________ State Agency ____________________

Date Employed ____________________

Educational Experience:

Position	Place of Employment	DATES	
		From	To

Education (if necessary, use reverse side of form to give additional information)

	credit hours			
College or University	semester	quarter	MAJOR	DEGREE

Signature of Applicant ____________________

Signature of State Director ____________________

PLEASE RETURN BY APRIL 15, 1970 TO:

Dr. Daniel D. Sage
805 South Crouse Avenue
Syracuse, New York 13210

APPENDIX K

INSTITUTE SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE
Special Study Institute
State Education Agency Simulation Exercise
June 15-26, 1970
Syracuse University

Monday, 15th	Tuesday, 16th	Wednesday, 17th	Thursday, 18th	Friday, 19th
Registration Physical Arrangements Welcome Dr. Burton Blatt Pre-test Institute Orientation Lecture-Discussion The Administration Process: Role and Organizational Variables"	The Simulation Process Introduction to Lafayette Orientation, Packet A Independent Study Flashback Bureau Staff Meeting Work Session Packet A	Feedback Responses to Orientation Items Lecture-Discussion "Criteria for Program Evaluation" Work Session "A Day in the Flack" Packet B	Feedback Lecture-Discussion "Analysis of Group Roles" Lecture Discussion " A Model for Problem Solving"	Group Task "Planning a S.S.I." Lecture-Discussion "Identifying Legislative Needs"
Lecture-Discussion "Thinking in the Future Tense" Dr. Tim Weaver Delphi, Round One "Generation of Future Events" Bookstore Break Reading Assignment	Individual Interview with Boss Preliminary Evaluation "The Looks of Lafayette What's Happening" Discussion "Ta Planning: Where to Begin?"	Feedback on the spot Work Session "Committee Task: the Process and the Content"	Application of a model; shared analysis, responses to Packet B Work Session "Larger Issues" Packet C	Work Session "Legislative Workshop" Fred Weintraub Alan Abeson

SCHEDULE
Special Study Institute
State Education Agency Simulation Exercise
June 15-26, 1970
Syracuse University

Monday, 22nd	Tuesday, 23rd	Wednesday, 24th	Thursday, 25th	Friday, 26th
Feedback, Packet C Legislative Workshop	Joint-Agency Planning Exercise	Feedback Packet E, A check on autoanalysis of problem solving behavior	"A Look at the Local" Simulation as a training tool	Evaluation of SEASE & SEATS as Training Instruments
Work Session Packet D "Monday Morning Headaches"	"The Personnel Training Issue"	The Delphi as a Pedagogical Process; Round Two, Estimates of Relevance & Probabilities	Micro-SEATS "A Day in Dormit"	Summary and Clean-up
Lecture-Discussion "Facilities as Reflections of Philosophy"		Cross-Impact Matrix		Post test
				ADJOURN
Feedback Packet D	Work Session Packet E "Role in the Middle: Relationships, V.I.P to LEA"	Planning Exercise "A Look Ahead, from the Outside"	Work Session B - C Packet	
Preparing the new State plan, 85-926			Feedback	

APPENDIX L

WORKSHOP EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

S.E.A.S.E.

Workshop Evaluation Interview Schedule

Interviewer's Role

The interviewer's role is to obtain maximum participant reaction to the structure outlined on the following pages. Be sure the entire session is taped. (Do not tape near the vents of an air conditioner.) A group of 4 or 5 participants is considered adequate for this type of an interview schedule.

1. Recalling your perspective, beliefs, and feelings toward administration of special education programs at the state level prior to this workshop, has anything changed as a result of *your* participation? And if anything has changed what will you do about it?

Sub points

1.1 Do you now possess more information?

1.2 Do you now have a better understanding of the issues and problems in administration of special education programs at the state level?

1.3 What do you believe are the major problems and issues?

1.4 Given that you can identify the major problems and issues, has this workshop given you any ideas on how to bring about change relative to solving these problems?

1.5 Can you be specific?

2. Was this simulation experience effective or could the time have been more efficiently spent in a different type of activity?

3. Given that it may be possible to conduct other workshops of a similar nature in the future, with another group of administrators of special education programs at the state level, what would you like to see included and/or deleted in such an endeavor? (Attempt to get convergent suggestions--rearrangement of presented structure; but strongly encourage any divergent innovative idea.)

APPENDIX M

WORKSHOP EVALUATION OPINIONNAIRE

(Including Response Summary Data)

S.E.A.S.E.
Opinionaire

Directions: Please circle the letter in front of the response that most nearly approaches your opinion to the statement.

1. As compared to other methods by which a course in special education administration could have been presented, I feel that the use of simulation exercises in this workshop has been

18 a. a highly appropriate and valuable approach.
5 b. a better than average approach.
1 c. no better nor worse than any other approach.
______ d. not as good as some other methods might have been.
______ e. generally inappropriate.

2. Specifically, the written "In basket" items seem to be

14 a. outstandingly realistic.
7 b. fairly realistic.
2 c. conceivable.
1 d. somewhat lacking in realism.
______ e. highly unrealistic.

3. In terms of time spent on follow-up discussion of the simulation material, discussion was

0 a. far too lengthy.
2 b. more than enough.
6 c. about the right amount.
14 d. not quite enough.
1 e. not nearly enough.

4. In terms of the total time spent on simulated activities versus other workshop content, the emphasis on simulation was

0 a. way too much.
10 b. a little too much.
11 c. about right.
1 d. could have had more.
______ e. should have been much more.

5. I feel that the simulation approach could be enhanced most by greater use of

4 a. role playing situations.
8 b. oral communication situations.
4 c. visual pictorial input.
0 d. written communications.
8 e. an equal mix of the above.

6. In terms of the amount of time which needs to be spent on background information as a prerequisite to problem solving activity, the amount of background data provided should be

1 a. much more.
15 b. somewhat more.
7 c. about as we had it.
0 d. less than we had it.
0 e. not really necessary at all.

7. The group size was

0 a. much too large.
0 b. a little too large.
23 c. just about right.
0 d. a little too small.
0 e. much too small.

8. This workshop would be best for people who were

15 a. administrators beginning in special education. units in state education agencies.
0 b. administrators with more than two years experience in state education agencies.
6 c. state directors of special education programs.
0 d. local directors of special education programs.
3 e. students majoring in special education administration.

9. I feel that the time spent on "future planning" was

5 a. extremely worthwhile.
10 b. worthwhile.
8 c. possibly worthwhile.
0 d. a waste of time.

10. The video tapes were

6 a. very realistic and a valuable experience.
0 b. very realistic but not a valuable experience.
7 c. realistic and a valuable experience.
2 d. realistic but not a valuable experience.
7 e. unrealistic but a valuable experience.
1 f. unrealistic and not a valuable experience.

11. The telephone calls I received were

9 a. very realistic and a valuable experience.
1 b. very realistic but not a valuable experience.
8 c. realistic and a valuable experience.
1 d. realistic but not a valuable experience.
4 e. unrealistic but a valuable experience.
______ f. unrealistic and not a valuable experience.

12. The role playing situation developing regulations for "Educationally Handicapped" was

4 a. very realistic and a valuable experience.
0 b. very realistic but not a valuable experience.
15 c. realistic and a valuable experience.
1 d. realistic but not a valuable experience.
3 e. unrealistic but a valuable experience.
______ f. unrealistic and not a valuable experience.

13. The Legislative work session was

13 a. very realistic and a valuable experience.
0 b. very realistic but not a valuable experience.
10 c. realistic and a valuable experience.
0 d. realistic but not a valuable experience.
0 e. unrealistic but a valuable experience.
0 f. unrealistic and not a valuable experience.

14. The role playing situation (Personnel Training Issue) was

2 a. very realistic and a valuable experience.
0 b. very realistic but not a valuable experience.
17 c. realistic and a valuable experience.
1 d. realistic but not a valuable experience.
3 e. unrealistic but a valuable experience.
0 f. unrealistic and not a valuable experience.

15. The lectures were

__18__ a. interesting and valuable.
__0__ b. interesting but not valuable.
__4__ c. routine but valuable.
__0__ d. routine and not valuable.
__2__ e. boring but valuable.
__1__ f. boring and not valuable.

16. The overall value of the workshop to me was

__15__ a. extremely worthwhile.
__9__ b. worthwhile.
______ c. possibly worthwhile.
______ d. a waste of time.

17. As compared to the usual class having one instructor, the team teaching available in this situation (multiple instructors) was

__16__ a. a great advantage.
__5__ b. of some advantage.
______ c. of little or no consequence.
__2__ d. somewhat clumsy.
______ e. a source of considerable confusion.

18. Which statement best describes the circumstances of your attendance at this workshop

__2__ a. at boss's direction, with little chance for declining
__15__ b. at boss's offer, but with freedom of choice.
__6__ c. with permission of boss, but primarily of your own volition.

APPENDIX N

TRIAL PROBLEM SOLVING EXERCISE

INSTRUCTIONS

You are Marion Kent the newly appointed State Director of the Bureau of Special Education in the Department of Public Instruction in the State of Floriformia. You have just arrived in your office and have found the attached material on your desk. Turn this page and acquaint yourself with the situation as presented in the following two pieces of correspondence.

When you have finished reading the correspondence, wait for further instructions before turning on to another page.

2

SHELDON CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
P.O. Box 2000
Sheldon, Florifornia

Dr. John Brown
Supt. of Public Instruction
Capital City, Florifornia

Dear John:

I have taken the liberty of enclosing a copy of a letter that was received by my Director of Special Education yesterday.

As you can clearly see from the contents of this letter, it appears that Mr. Lampron is coming down to Sheldon to inspect us. It was my understanding that the philosophy of the State Education Department was to provide supervisory assistance, and not act as policeman. I brought this matter to your attention so that you may be aware of the type of correspondence that we have been receiving from your department.

I would appreciate your reactions to this rather dictatorial style of supervision.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Strunk
Superintendent of Schools

BS/smk
Enclosure

STATE OF FLORIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
BUREAU OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
Capital City, Floriformia

John Brown
Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Leslie Jones
Director of
Special Education

Mr. William Collins
Director of Special Education
Sheldon Central School District
Sheldon, Florifornia

Dear Mr. Collins:

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to your new position and to advise you that I intend to be visiting in your county in the near future and would hope to be able to see you early next month.

One of the main things I am interested in exploring as I visit in the area has to do with certification of children in EMR classes. We have always had excellent cooperation with the Sheldon School District in the manner in which the recommended state standards have been followed, but I am also keenly aware of my responsibility to the children of this state to see that standards are followed for the total welfare of all children. Since we periodically hear reports of standards being ignored or stretched in some of the "less enlightened" areas of the state, I have the obligation to remain alert to such problems particularly where state funds for the education of the mentally retarded are involved.

I will call you later next week to arrange for an appointment when my itinerary is better established.

Sincerely yours,

Al Lampron
Consultant for the Mentally Retarded
Bureau of Special Education

AL/smk

INFORMATION INPUT

In order to deal with the situation presented on the two previous pages you might wish to secure more information. Recalling that getting information sometimes costs time and/or money, list below the possible nature or content of additional information which you would wish to have.

List below the possible sources of additional information you might wish to have.

Time limit 5 minutes.

Stop here and wait for further instructions!

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Do not go back and modify anything you have written on the previous page.

As a result of your efforts in securing additional information you have learned that

1. State regulations do mandate that standards regarding IQ levels and numbers of children enrolled in special classes must be observed in order for local school districts to qualify for special state financial reimbursement.
2. The Superintendent of Public Instruction has expressed to all staff, the goal of changing the image of the state education agency from an "inspector" role to "helping consultant".
3. Mr. Lampron has information, in the form of a letter from someone in Sheldon claiming violation of state standards.
4. Records from your predecessor indicate previous incidents in which Lampron's approach to the field has caused complaints.

Stop here and wait for further instructions!

ISSUES

6

What do you see as critical issues in dealing with this situation?

List them below.

Time limit 5 minutes.

Stop here and wait for further instructions!

After you have secured the needed information and considered the issues involved, what procedures would you follow to work toward a solution to this situation?

Time limit 5 minutes.

Stop here and wait for further instructions

APPENDIX O

SCORING CATEGORIES FOR THE TRIAL PROBLEM SOLVING EXERCISE

Ground Rules for Scoring

If two or more responses cover basically the same item on the list of credits, or cover specific details falling within one such item, only one point is credited.

If one response could fall under two or more items on the list, but it is unclear as to which one, only one point is credited. (Exception--on organization and planning, both the "with whom" and "about what" are scored. e.g., form A, "Confer with local director regarding other possible placements," would be scored 1,5.)

If a response is recorded on the wrong page, e.g., a procedure leading to final conclusion placed on the issues page, no credit is given. (Exception--if a procedure is stated in terms of an ultimate goal, rather than as steps in the process to the solution, it may show awareness of an issue and if placed on that page could be credited.)

If the meaning of a response (or handwriting) is unclear or vague, do not "force" it into a credited category.

If content and sources are mixed up on Info Input page score as if they were on the correct half of the page.

Four separate scores will be recorded:

1. Info Input, Content
2. Info Input, Human sources
3. Issues
4. Organization and Planning

Form B

Info Input

Content

1. What are the relevant state laws and regulations?
2. What is the general status of local program (types and number of classes)?
3. What is Lampron's rationale for writing this letter?
4. Are there conditions (in Sheldon or in state in general) which would invite this kind of checking?
5. What is SEA policy?
6. What is in SEA files (records, reports) regarding this district?
7. What are the local procedures for placing children?
8. How does Lampron see his role?
9. Is Lampron's competency in question?
10. Why is district (Supt.) defensive?
11. Has there been a history of problems of this type with Lampron?
12. Has there been a history of similar interaction with this Supt. or District?
13. Does personal friendship between Superintendents present a special problem?

Source

1. Lampron
2. LEA personnel in general
3. SEA personnel in general

Issues

1. The role of SEA (conflict between inspector vs. helper)
2. Local autonomy vs. centralized control
3. The validity of existing standards (pro or con)
4. The attention given to LEA complaints, when they have status (LEA Supt., friendship with SEA Supt.)
5. Maintenance of communication (public/human relations) or failure thereof

Organization and Planning

1. Confer (communicate, work with) LEA personnel
2. Confer (communicate, work with) SEA personnel
3. Lay-out (set up, suggest, list, interpret, present) alternative strategies (solutions)
4. Interpret roles to those involved
5. Call attention to (and enforce) existing standards (laws-regulations, policies)
6. Establish additional guidelines (policies-standards)